



LIBRARY OF THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

PRINCETON, N. J.

---

PURCHASED BY THE  
MRS. ROBERT LENOX KENNEDY CHURCH HISTORY FUND.

---

BR 146 .S78 1919 v.2  
Stephenson, Andrew, 1856-  
1927.  
The history of Christianity  
..







WORLD WORSHIPS SERIES

---

HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY, in 4 Volumes. *By Andrew Stephenson*

SEX WORSHIP AND SYMBOLISM OF PRIMITIVE RACES. *By Sanger Brown, II.*

DEVIL WORSHIP, THE SACRED BOOKS AND TRADITIONS OF THE YEZIDIZ. *By Isya Joseph.*

ZOROASTRIANISM AND JUDAISM. *By George William Carter.*

MESSIAHS: CHRISTIAN AND PAGAN. *By Wilson D. Wallis.*

ROMAN EMPEROR-WORSHIP. *By Louis Matthews Sweet.*

---

RICHARD G. BADGER, PUBLISHER, BOSTON

NOV 4 1919

CLERICAL SEMINARY

# THE HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY

---

FROM GREGORY THE GREAT TO THE  
ESTABLISHMENT OF PAPAL AUTOCRACY

---

BY

ANDREW STEPHENSON, A.M., PH.D.  
*Sometime Professor of History in DePauw University*

FOUR VOLUMES

VOLUME Two



BOSTON  
RICHARD G. BADGER  
THE GORHAM PRESS

COPYRIGHT, 1919, BY RICHARD G. BADGER

—  
All Rights Reserved

Made in the United States of America

—  
The Gorham Press, Boston, U.S.A.

## CONTENTS

### THIRD PERIOD

#### FROM THE FALL OF THE WESTERN ROMAN EMPIRE TO GREGORY THE GREAT (475-490)

##### BOOK V. THE CHURCH AND THE NEW NATIONALITIES

CHAPTER	PAGE
XXI. THE INVADERS OF ITALY . . . . .	13-52
The Barbarian world; The Germans; Germanic culture; Inherent vitality of the Germans; Religion of the Germans; German military system; Government of the Germans; Contrast between German and Roman States;	
The Goths;	
Origin of the Goths doubtful; First historical appearance; Early associations; Gothic home on the Dnieper; Visigoths and Ostrogoths; Relations with Rome; Aurelian gives Dacia to Visigoths (274); Conversion of Goths to Arian Christianity; Nature of the Christianity of Ulfilas; Empire of Ermanaric; Permanent separation of the Visigoths and Ostrogoths;	
The Visigoths;	
Battle of Adrianople; Visigoths defeat the Romans (378); Alaric made king; Undertakes Italian campaign; Turned back by Stilicho; Sack of Rome (410); Death of Alaric; Ataulfus king; Visigoths in Gaul; Alliance with Rome; Ataulfus murdered; Establishment of Visigothic kingdom; Theodoric succeeds to the throne; War with Huns; Euric king; Alaric II (485); Defeat of Clovis; Civil war and weakness; Government of Visigoths; King and nobility; Visigothic Law; Reorganization of Leovigild; Recarred succeeds; Visigoths converted to Catholicism; The enervated Visigoths can not withstand the Saracens (711); Disappearance of Visigoths.	
The Vandals;	
Northern frontier of Rome unprotected; Early condition of the Vandals; Home in Pomerania; Vandals invade Gaul; Cross through into Africa; Gaeseric king of the Vandals; Conquest of Roman Africa; Naval preëminence of the Vandals; Sack of Rome; Administration of Gaeseric; Division of the people and allotment of the land; Method of taxation and Military service; Arianism of the Vandals; Persecution of the Orthodox; Vandals rapidly Romanized; Death of Gaeseric; Conquest and disappearance of the Vandals (534).	
The Ostrogoths;	
Wanderings in the empire; Theodoric's early life; Became	

CHAPTER	PAGE
king; Theodoric decides on conquest; They march into Italy; Odoacer and the Heruli; Affairs in Italy; The Rise of Odoacer; Conquest of the Western Empire; Theodoric defeats Odoacer; Treaty with Odoacer; Murder of Odoacer; Establishment of the Ostrogothic empire; Theodoric's Alliance; Nature of Theodoric's reign; Partition of the land; Policy in his two-fold position; Two classes of subjects; Theodoric's code of laws; Theodoric restores the prosperity of Italy; Civil administration; Theodoric's religious policy; Brought about a high state of civilization; Results of his rule; Last years; Death of Theodoric in 526; Rapid decay of Ostrogothic power; Civil War and anarchy; Revival of Roman power under Justinian; Ostrogoths are conquered and perish (552).	
The Lombards;	
Italy under Roman rule; Narses recalled; Invitation to the Lombards; Lombard conquest of Italy; Character of the Lombards; Early history; Alboin, king of the Lombards; Succeeded by Clef; Lombards never became centralized; Dukes remain independent for ten years; Kingship restored; Autharis institutes feudal customs; Lombards become Orthodox; First Lombard Laws (648); Nature of the Lombard Kingdom; Growing strength of the Papacy; Lombards overcome by the Franks (774); Gradual amalgamation of the Lombards with the Latin population.	
<b>XXII. THE FRANKS FROM CLOVIS TO CHARLEMAGNE . . . . .</b>	<b>53-67</b>
Franks under Clovis; Ripuarian Franks and Salian Franks; Clovis defeats Rome; The story of the vase; Clovis' kingdom; Germanic wars of Clovis; Marries Clotilda; Clovis converted to Catholicism; Clovis and his followers baptized; Conquest of Burgundy; Campaign against the Visigoths; Franks victorious; Capture of Toulouse; Given Roman titles; Moves his capital to Paris; Consolidation of the Franks; Franks under Clovis; Disposes of his relatives; Death of Clovis, 511.	
Carolingians;	
Origin of the Carolingians; Results of Pippin's rule; Pippin's sons; Civil wars; Charles becomes ruler of all the Franks; Battle of Tours; Death of Charles; Pippin the Short sole ruler of the Franks; Pippin's bargain with the Pope.	
<b>XXIII. THE ANGLO-SAXONS . . . . .</b>	<b>68-106</b>
The Saxons in their old home; The various tribes; Nature of the country; Nature of the people; Social life of the Saxons; Religion of the Saxons; The Saxon temper; Saxon piracy; Conquest and Settlement of Britain;	
Description of the country; Prehistoric Britain; The Neolithic man; First invasion of the Celts; The coming of the Romans; Caesar's first British campaign; Caesar's second campaign; Conquest of Britain by Tiberius Claudius; Britain under Octavius; Britain under Suetonius Paulinus; Britain under Agricola; Religion in Britain; Decay of Roman power;	

## Contents

vii

<b>CHAPTER</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
Roman conquest never completed; Invitation to the Jutes; Landing of Hengest and Horsa; Kentish kingdom founded; Establishment of the Saxon Kingdoms; Sussex 401; Wessex 510; Essex 526;	1
Establishment of the Angloian kingdoms; Northumberland, 547; Mercia, 584; East Anglia, 572.	2
Conquest of the West Saxons.	3
Conquest of the Angles.	4
The Heptarchy.	5
Conversion of the Saxons; Early paganism; Conversion of Kent; Ethelbert, king of Kent; marries Bertha; Gregory and the Angle captives; Augustine and his monks; Conversion of Ethelbert and his people; Civilizing of Kent; Code of Laws.	6
Conversion of Essex.	7
Conversion of East Anglia.	8
Conversion of the Anglo-Saxons.	9
Conversion of Northumbria; Edwin unites Mercia and Deira; Marries Ethelberga; Conversion of Edwin and his followers; Death of Edwin and lapse into barbarism; Reconversion by monks from Iona.	10
Conversion of Wessex, 695.	11
Conversion of Mercia; Paganism under Penda; Battle of Winwaed and the Christianization of Mercia in 655.	12
Conversion of Sussex, 682.	13
Roman and Irish Christianity; Struggle between Roman and Irish Christianity; Wilfrid and the Synod of Whitby; The work of Theodore; Council of Hertford, 678; Permanent organization of the Church; Results of Theodore's efforts; Other early churchmen; Benedict Biscop.	14
Cuthbert.	15
Caedmon.	16
The Struggle for Political Supremacy; Position of the seven kingdoms;	17
Northumberland supremacy; Division into Deira and Bernicia; Northumbria under Ethelric and Ethelfrid; Under Edwin; Northumbria reunited under Oswy; End of Northumbrian Supremacy, 650.	18
Supremacy of Mercia; Mercia under Penda and Wulfhere; Ethelred; Mercia at its height under Ethelbald; Mercia under Offa; End of Mercian Supremacy.	19
Supremacy of Wessex; Weakened by civil war till ninth century; Egbert obtains West Saxon throne in 807; Conquest of Cornwall and Mercia, 820; Northumbria submits to Wessex and <i>Wessex becomes England</i> .	20
<b>XXIV. ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE PAPACY . . . .</b>	<b>107-130</b>
Origin of the Papacy; Greek churches became a Federation of Republics; Little accomplished by the Eastern Church; Western	21

CHAPTER	PAGE
Christianity; Organization and language Greek; Rome did nothing more than the East; Development of the Priesthood; Council of Elvira; Decretal of Siricius.	
Innocent I;	
Sack of Rome by Alaric; Building up of the papacy; Papal Monarchy succeeds to the Roman Empire; Death of Innocent in 417.	
Leo the Great;	
Leo as a preacher; Letter of Septimus to Leo making a complaint; Letter of Leo to the offending Metropolitan; Leo and the Manichaeans; Clash between Leo and Hilary of Arles; Case of Projectus; Edict of Valentinian III; Turrilius appeals to Leo in the case of the Priscillians; The Tome of Leo.	
<b>XXV. MOHAMMED AND HIS TEACHINGS . . . . .</b>	<b>131-147</b>
Arabia and the Arabs; Birth of Mohammed; Death.	
Teachings;	
(1) Prayer; (2) Almsgiving; (3) Fasting; (4) Pilgrimages; Six Articles of Faith; Successes of Mohammed.	
Abou-Bekr;	
Speech of Abou-Bekr.	
Omar;	
Progress of Mohammedan Arms; Spirit of the Faith of Islam.	
<b>BOOK VI. RELATION OF THE CHURCH TO CIVIL AUTHORITY</b>	
<b>XXVI. CHARLEMAGNE AND HIS INFLUENCE ON CHRISTIAN CIVILIZATION . . . . .</b>	<b>151-166</b>
Youth of Charlemagne; Sole ruler; Character of the young king; Love of greatness.	
Wars of Charlemagne;	
Conquest of Aquitania and Lombardy; Stops Saxon Invasions; Military skill; Causes of success.	
Administration of Charlemagne;	
Materials for organization; (1) Civil administration: Central administration; Nature of Charlemagne's Capitularies; Economic legislation; Local Administration;	
First class of agents; Dukes of Provinces;	
Second class of agents; <i>Missi Dominici</i> .	
Ecclesiastical Administration.	
Charlemagne's Coronation;	
No emperor of the West since 476; Meets the Pope; Arrival in Rome; Doings in Rome; The coronation ceremony.	
Death.	
Results;	
Failed to establish permanent government; Central government decayed; Local government lived.	
<b>XXVII. FEUDALISM AND THE CHURCH . . . . .</b>	<b>167-189</b>
Transition to feudalism.	
Elements of feudalism;	

CHAPTER	PAGE
Institutions containing one or more of these feudal elements; Elements which lived; Pre-feudal use of the word Vassal; Land relationship; Legalizing of the Feudal Institutions; Military service; Legal jurisdiction; Geographical extent of territory.	
Feudalism Proper;	
Lawyer's theory of feudalism; Description of the castle; Feudal society; The Feudal rit- ual; Obligations of a vassal to his suzerain; Obligations of the suzerain to his vassal; Revenues of a fief.	
Feudalism and the Church.	
Summary.	
<b>XXVIII. THE CRUSADES . . . . .</b>	<b>190-214</b>
Introduction.	
Classification;	
Eastern Crusades;	
First crusade; second crusade; third crusade; fourth cru- sade; fifth crusade; sixth crusade; seventh crusade.	
Western Crusades;	
Norman Conquest; The Albigensian crusade; the Prussian crusade.	
Motives of the Crusades;	
Religious;	
Passion for pilgrimages; Mussulman interference with pil- grims; Agitation by enthusiasts such as Pope Urban II and Peter the Hermit.	
Secular;	
General poverty; Ambition of temporal princes; Ambition of feudal aristocracy; Hopes of the multitude.	
State of Crusading Society;	
Popular ignorance and credulity; The excesses of the crusad- ers; Expeditions of Rabbles; Improvidence and superstition, illustrated by the siege of Antioch; Barbarities in the city of Jerusalem.	
Consequences of the Crusades;	
Intellectual;	
New Ideas of government; New ideas of commercial enter- prise; New ideas of Industry.	
Political;	
Extended the boundaries of Christendom; Helped to unify France and Spain. Undermined feudalism to the advantage of monarchy; By the consolidation of fiefs; By modifying the military system; They weakened the power of feudal, over non-feudal classes; By removing obstructions to emancipation of serfs; By diffusing ideas of human equality.	
Ecclesiastical;	
Increase of the power of Rome; Final separation between Eastern and Western Christendom; Partial emancipation of European thought.	

CHAPTER		PAGE
<b>XXIX. THE CONVERSION OF THE GERMANS . . . . .</b>		<b>215-222</b>
(1) The British Missionaries;		
(2) The Frankish Missionaries;		
(3) The Anglo-Saxon Missionaries;		
Boniface.		
<b>XXX. THE CONVERSION OF SCANDINAVIA . . . . .</b>		<b>223-228</b>
Invasion of the Northmen; Missionary movements.		
Anschar;		
Character of Anschar; Conversion of Norway.		
St. Olaf;		
Résumé.		
<b>XXXI. THE SLAVS . . . . .</b>		<b>229-234</b>
Methodius, 868; Bohemia and Hungary.		
<b>BOOK VII. THE EMPIRE AND THE PAPACY</b>		
<b>XXXII. THEORIES OF UNIVERSAL GOVERNMENT . . . . .</b>		<b>237-241</b>
Introduction; The common people; The old German population; The Emperor and the Pope; The State-Church theory; The Church-State or Papal theory; These theories in conflict.		
<b>XXXIII. THE WAR OF INVESTITURES . . . . .</b>		<b>242-284</b>
(a) Tendencies in the Empire.		
(b) Tendencies in the Church.		
(c) Attempts at reform;		
The council in the Lateran; Pope Alexander II.		
(d) Henry IV and Gregory VII;		
Youth of Henry Hildebrand; Designs of Hildebrand.		
Second Lateran Synod.		
The struggle;		
Henry excommunicated; Canossa.		
<b>XXXIV. THE REVOLT OF THE ITALIAN STATES . . . . .</b>		<b>285-306</b>
Origin of the Municipal government of the Italian Cities;		
(a) Conflict between the people and their rulers;		
(b) Imperial rule in Italy.		
(c) Republican revolution;		
(1) Arnold of Brescia; Abelard; Frederic Barbarossa.		
(2) The Church lending its influence to the cities to undermine the Empire.		
<b>XXXV. THE TRIUMPH OF THE PAPACY . . . . .</b>		<b>307-320</b>
Condition of the Christian World at the Accession of Innocent III.		
Reign of Innocent; Fourth Lateran Council;		
Frederic II;		
Political theory of Frederic; Death of Frederic;		
The Fall of the Hohenstaufen.		
Europe becomes a theocracy administered by the Popes.		
Résumé.		

## **THIRD PERIOD**

---

**FROM THE FALL OF THE WESTERN ROMAN  
EMPIRE TO GREGORY THE GREAT**

**(475-590)**

---

### **BOOK V**

**THE CHURCH AND THE NEW NATIONALITIES**



# THE HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY

## CHAPTER XXI

### THE INVADERS OF ITALY

**“W**HEN Rome called herself Mistress of the World, she knew well enough it was an exaggeration, and that her bounds were not of the earth also. Cruel experience had taught her that she had not one frontier that was not threatened by tribes hidden in the depths of the North, the South of the West."

If we turn our attention to the land lying north of the Danube and east of the Rhine, we will there find three great races, or more properly belts of people: (1) The Germans, (2) the Slavs, north and east of the Germans, and (3) the Huns, Lapps, and Finns, north and east of the Slavs. Of these belts of people the Germans are of special interest to us. The word *German* is of Celtic origin and probably means "neighbors," possibly "shouters." The word *Deutsch* does not occur until the ninth century and was not then the usual designation. The Germans themselves claimed to have had a common origin, all of them regarding Mannus, the first man, and the son of the God Tuisco, as their common father. Mannus is represented as having three sons and from one or the other of these three sons each and every German was descended, thus having a god-like ancestry. These Germans were known by many and various tribal names, as Goths, Burgundians, Suevi, Alemanni, Vandals, Lombards, Franks, and Saxons; but in their fundamental ideas of government, religion, language, and manners they were alike.

It is impossible to imagine any two conditions of life more

opposite than that existing among the civilized and effeminate Romans south of the Danube, and that of the Germanic tribes to the north of the Danube. The Germans had no cities, but lived instead in rude villages or stockades which were fortified by *tuns*, thick-set hedges made by the lopping together of trees and the ingrowing of brambles and vines. Freely they roamed over the plains and the valleys among the hills of their fatherland. They paid little attention to agriculture, which fell chiefly to the lot of the women. Sufficient grain was sown to carry them through the winter, but they produced no surplus for purposes of exchange and they had no knowledge of the use of money. They had no property, as we understand the word, but the ownership of the land was vested in the whole community or *tun*. The magistrates distributed to each family the lot to be cultivated and, when the harvest was gathered in, these same magistrates saw to it that the produce was proportionately distributed. Their food was chiefly meat, furnished partly by the chase, and partly by their ill-kept droves of stunted and deformed cattle. Milk, cheese, coarse bread, and turnips supplemented this liberal supply of flesh but were not used in great abundance. They dressed in what they could not eat, the skins of animals of the chase, or rudely woven cloth. This clothing was closely fitted to the form, making another point of contrast to the full flowing robes of the Greek and Romans. It is from our German ancestors we obtain our trousers. All of the old historians testify to their purity of life. In this respect the contrast between them and the Celts of Britain, the Huns of Asia, and our own American Indians is very striking. However this may be, sobriety was not one of their virtues, as to be a hero with them was not merely to be foremost on the field of battle, but to be also the hardest drinker in the bouts which lasted till break of day. They fought like demons and they fed like swine. They also were filled with a passion for gambling, and staked their all, wife, children, liberty, on a single throw of the dice. The life of the forest had been for centuries building up these warriors to be capable of bearing the cold, patient of fatigue, and above all, "brave beyond any people of the

earth." The Germans were a race of giants and their fierce blue eyes and yellow flaxen hair served to make them more terrible to the smaller, darker Roman. War was their delight. Both Caesar and Tacitus speak of the fury with which they rushed into battle, of their indifference to wounds, and even of the gladness with which they met the death which sent them to live forever with Odin.

As pictured by Tacitus the Germans were taking the first steps in civilization. In capacity to develop, to become civilized, the German was incomparably superior to any other savage people, especially so to the red Indian of America. Ever since we have known them the Indians have been a decreasing race; the Germans have been an increasing one, in spite of war and famine and pestilence and all the ills of a precarious forest life, proving their youthful strength and vitality by a reproduction unparalleled in history. Their susceptibility was great and their progress very rapid. The Romans were not slow in discovering this and they saw with dread and awe that they were face to face with a people such as they had never before seen. At the time of the migration, the Goths especially had considerable culture, and wherever they went they absorbed not only some of the vices of more civilized peoples, a step taken by every barbarian, but, also, picked up agriculture, military science, architecture, law, and religion. They had even translated the Bible into their own tongue. Other barbarians the Romans civilized either passed the danger point or off the face of the earth, but they could not do this with the Germans. He kept his pristine vigor and took at the same time greedily whatever the Roman had to give him. The Germans were deeply religious people, yet for pagans they were little superstitious. Their religion corresponded well to their spirit of pride and heroism, bloodthirsty passion, and love of glory, and yet there was a certain charm mingled with their terrible fancies. The supreme power which was conceived by other Arian heathen as light, sky, or sun, they worshipped as the *good*, a moral being, "Gott" (God), this word existing without an article in all the primitive dialects. Moral ideas were not lacking and consequently a natural thought with them was a moral

god. Besides this moral being, "Gott," the Germans had Woden, who gives victory, and who comes nightly from the heavenly palace, the windows of which open towards the east, to ride through the air with the dead warriors: Donar, the German Hercules, the Thor of the Norsemen. He is the mighty thunderer and is armed with a hammer which he flings at his enemies, but which returns ever to his hand. These are the dwellers on the German Olympus, who with the goddesses Freya, the northern Venus; Hulda, the chaste Diana, and Herthe, the goddess of the earth, who everywhere carries peace and the arts, made up the deities of the Germans. The paradise of these doughty warriors was thoroughly in keeping with their practical ideas of happiness, a place where warriors fought and drank without ceasing. This is especially worthy of note because one's heaven is always his highest ideal. He never in this life attains to it, but always strives that way. The Germans, following this law, drank everything fluid except water and fought whenever opportunity offered. Love of individual independence and voluntary devotion were the basis of Germanic character. These are today their special characteristics. Adventurous war, carried on for glory and booty afar from home, was their chief delight. Every German freeman was a soldier and a citizen, and between citizenship and military duty there was no line of demarkation. Their warfare partook of the nature of their individual independence. Each warrior attached himself to some chief of great renown, distinguished mayhap, like Saul, the son of Kish, by being head and shoulders above his fellows, or like Pippin, who could sever the heads of a bull and a lion with one stroke of his sword. Him he followed in peace and war, with other warriors recruited in the same way. Together they formed the *comitatus* or *gefolge* of the chief, and were ready to sacrifice their lives for him, bound only by a voluntary obligation, by bonds of honor alone. The individual is everywhere magnified. In case the whole nation went upon the war path, the military unit remained the same. Each family or village community sent its able-bodied men under the command of its oldest or most warlike member. These, in turn, united with the men

from the other villages of the hundred under the leadership of the hundred-man, a leader chosen by reason of his kinship to every man in the hundred. The national army was composed of a certain but indefinite number of these hundred-units. Its organization was, therefore, loose and somewhat unwieldy, there being too much individual initiation and independence, and not enough subordination to central authority. To establish the despotism of a single man over such a people was an utter impossibility. They spurned everything that looked like subserviency and utterly loathed the discipline of the empire.

Their government was but an agglomeration of village communities such as I have already described. These communities were democracies where every freeman had a vote. They combined into districts which were presided over by an elective *graf* or count, but in each district an assembly, composed either of the freemen of the village or their representatives, settled all questions of importance and assumed complete judicial authority. The entire body of freemen composing these several judicial districts met for legislative purposes in one great national assembly or *folk-moot*. Here, they elected a leader for their military expeditions, passed necessary laws, and settled questions of peace and war. This assembly met at the new and full moon and was looked upon by the Germans as a divine institution. Larger confederations of tribes were formed upon the same plan and with the same object. A leader was chosen in the same way. This is the only idea which the German had of a state. It had no geographical boundaries. It was not fast to the soil. It was a peripatetic state, a walking *civitas*, and the individual was the active unit. Mark well the direct contrast between this state and the one found south of the Danube and west of the Rhine. In the one, extreme individualism; in the other centralization, law. In the one everything for the man, in the other nothing of importance but the state. Neither one satisfies all the conditions of modern polities, but a hasty glance reveals the one which more nearly measures up to that standard. Rome has given us in a manner at least, (1) organized Christianity, or the Church: (2) the

Roman organization and administration; (3) civil law as it relates to the rights of persons and property; (4) the general use of the Latin language. Europe has profoundly felt the influence of each of them. England and America, but sparingly. Over all the Germanic principles have finally dominated, and in England and America these principles have remained nearly pure.

The exodus of the great Germanic tribes from their old homes was preceded by several subsidiary movements, such as that of the Cimbri and Teutones into Italy, the march of Ariovistus and his German followers in 8 b. c. and the invasion of the Marcomanni into the empire in 180 a. d. But these did not succeed in establishing themselves in their new quarters, and we need not therefore tarry with them here, although there were many minor tribes that played a part in this great Exodus; the chief ones are: (1) the Visigoths, (2) the Vandals, (3) the Ostrogoths, (4) the Lombards, and (5) the Franks.

When or for what reason the Germanic family of which the Goths were a portion migrated westwards from the Asiatic home of the Aryan race it is impossible to tell. The ethnologists are not fully settled touching the matter of an Asiatic home. Narrowing the question down to the Goths merely we are still constrained to answer in the same way. The origin of the Goths has never been ascertained. The first clear utterance of a tradition among them points to a Scandinavian home, and some historians accept this as a solution of the problem, even going so far as to claim that the Garden of Eden was located in the Scandinavian peninsula and that there the human race originated. There are others who do not accept this, but are inclined to look further. There has also been much obscurity even in the use of the name, Goths. Professor Freeman says, "The name has been used as one of contempt; as designating anything mediaeval or 'romantic'; in the stead of Teutonic as a wide term of designation; applied to a style of architecture which has nothing Gothic save the name." All these must be carefully distinguished from the prosaic history of the true national Goths who played a conspicuous part in Europe from

the third to the eighth century of the Christian Era. On many grounds the Goths may claim the foremost place among the Germanic nations who had a share in the breaking up of the Roman power. They were probably the earliest of the Germanic nations to establish themselves in the Empire as distinguished from those who merely ravaged the frontiers. Their first really historic appearance was upon the northern shore of the Black Sea; their great historical settlements were made in the far west. No Germanic people has played so great a part in the history of the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries and no Germanic people has left behind it such early remains of a written native literature. But probably the strangest thing in their history is that, after playing a chief part for so many ages, the Goths wholly passed away. They exist no place as a nation nor have they given a name to any part of Europe. Franks, Angles, Saxons, Burgundians, Frisians, Thuringians, Lombards, and Bavarians have each and all left a name upon a modern map, but the Goth has silently departed and is as trackless as is a mist in the desert.

Historically the Goths are associated with the Vandals and Gepids. The historian Procopius regards the three nations as mere sub-divisions of the one, and makes them identical in language, customs, and laws. There is no doubt of the truth of this statement in so far as the Gepids are concerned, but the Vandals are entitled to a separate classification.

We have already stated that the Goths had a traditional home in the Scandinavian peninsula, and later, on the shores of the Baltic Sea, but before their first impact with the Romans they were located in the region north of the Black Sea and west of the River Don. Sometime later they moved to the west, and in the middle of the third century are found dwelling upon either side of the Dnieper, extending northward well toward its source, and westward along the shore of the Black Sea, to the River Pruth. It was doubtless due to the fact of their dwelling upon the east and west banks of the Dnieper, respectively, that they became divided into the two great families of Ostrogoths (East Goths) and Visigoths (West Goths). After an interval in which they sank

almost entirely out of sight, they appeared again within the bounds of the Empire, in various relations of alliance and enmity, marching to and fro, but not making or even attempting to make any lasting settlement. In the fifth century they began to form really settled powers. This last period is confined to the short and brilliant dominion of the Ostrogoths in Italy and the more lasting but not less brilliant dominion of the Visigoths in Gaul and Spain.

The Goths are first vaguely mentioned as coming in contact with Roman arms in the short and disastrous reign of Antoninus Caracalla (211–217); but they begin to play a distinct part in the reign of Alexander Severus (222–235), at which time they make an excursion into Dacia and lay waste the entire country. In the reign of Philip (224–248) they pass the Danube and ravage Moesia and, in 251, the Emperor Decius fell in battle against them. From this time on they ravaged eastern Europe and western Asia far and wide until the year 269 when they were defeated by Claudius and were checked for a time in their movements into the Roman territory. In 274, the able Emperor Aurelian withdrew the Roman legions from Dacia and handed over that entire country to the Goths. He thus attempted by strategy to check the inroads of the barbarians and to draw in the boundaries of the Empire so as to make the Danube its northern limit. This act expanded the territory of the Goths so as to embrace the whole northwestern coast of the Black Sea and made of them an allied power to protect the boundary as far westward as the modern city of Buda-Pesth. This policy was followed by a peace of more than ninety years. Upon the withdrawal of the Roman troops, the Visigoths migrated from their old home and took possession of Dacia, while the Ostrogoths crossed over the Dnieper and occupied the territory but recently vacated by their kinsmen.

During the next century the Visigoths were converted to the Arian form of Christianity by the influence of Ulfila, the apostle to the Goths, who for forty years labored incessantly with these people to convert them to Christianity and teach them the rudiments of Roman civilization. It was he who invented the Gothic alphabet and translated the

Bible into the language of his people. He thus became the father and originator of all that Germanic literature which now fills the major part of the space in the libraries of the world. For the future philologist he performed a work of priceless value, furnishing a specimen of the Germanic language earlier by three hundred years than any other that has been preserved; but this was not his purpose when he undertook, unaided, his herculean task of turning the Septuagint and the Greek New Testament into the language of a barbarous and unlettered race. Rather was he inspired with the noble thought of Christianizing a heathen people and civilizing a barbarous race.

Here I must tarry to say that the form of Christianity taught by Ulfila and earnestly accepted by Visigoth, Ostrogoth, Vandal, Suevian, Burgundian and Lombard,—in fact, by all the Germans except by the Franks and the Saxons,—was but a slight modification of that of Arius, and for which he and his followers were condemned as heretics in the first Ecumenical Council held at Nicaea in 325 which also established the first of the Christological dogmas. Without entering into a discussion of the complex metaphysical question involved, which belongs to another part of this work, it may be here sufficient to state the creed adopted by the Arian Synod of Constantinople, in 360. “Neither *Homo-ousios* nor *Homoi-ousios* is to be found in our faith. Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, is like (*Homoi-los*) to the Father who begot Him according to the Scriptures.” This creed was signed by Bishop Ulfila and apparently believed by him. When on his death bed he composed a creed which contains these words: “I, Ulfila, bishop and confessor, have ever thus believed, and in this, the alone true faith, do I make my testament to my Lord. I believe that there is one God the Father, alone and unbegotten and invisible: and in his only-begotten Son our Lord and our God, artificer and maker of every creature, having none like unto himself . . . and in one Holy Spirit, an illuminating and sanctifying power, neither God nor Lord, but the minister of Christ, subject and obedient in all things to the Father.” There was, indeed, very little difference

between Arian and Orthodox and that, it is safe to say, no one understood; but it was sufficient to throw the Christian world into an un-Christian strife which lasted more than one hundred years and deluged the earth with blood.

About the middle of the fourth century a great power arose under Ermanaric, the Ostrogoth. He seems for a time to have united the Ostrogoths and Visigoths under his sway and to have extended his empire from the Danube to the Baltic. If this is to be believed at all, his power at best was merely that of an overlord and the Ostrogoths and Visigoths still remained distinct, the latter retaining the power of making war and peace on their own account. Toward the end of the reign of Ermanaric several causes joined together to break his great dominion asunder. His people were divided into Christian and non-Christian, Visigoth and Ostrogoth, all disunited and jarring. But the greatest cause of division was from without. The first of those movements of the Turanian race into the territory north of the Danube was now taking place. Ermanaric was defeated in an attempt to stem this new influx of barbarism and died shortly afterwards of his wounds and his grief over the overthrow of his people. The Ostrogoths stayed north of the Danube and soon passed under the overlordship of the Hun. The Visigoths put themselves under the protection of the Empire and were first assigned a district near the mouth and to the south of the Danube, but afterwards came into possession of Moesia and a portion of Thrace. This great migration took place a century after their settlement in Dacia, under their leader, Frithigern. But the hoped-for peace which led this nation, now Christian and semi-civilized, to seek a new home within the boundaries of the Empire was destined to fail by reason of the greed and lust of the Roman officials. After being cheated and starved for a period of two years, the Visigoths once more unfurled their banners and appealed to the god of war. In the great battle of Adrianople, in 378, they completely overthrew the Roman forces under the leadership of the emperor Valens and made themselves the practical masters of the eastern Empire. Valens fell in the battle, and his successors, Gra-

tian and Theodosius the Great, made terms, in 381, by which the Visigoths were given lands in Moesia and Thrace. The death of Theodosius, which took place in 395, broke up this union between the Visigoths and the Empire. The Visigoths chose Alaric as their king and again unfurled the national banner.

For a time Alaric seems to have had no clear idea as to his course of action. He spent some time in marching about in a rather aimless fashion throughout the Eastern Empire. He next undertook a series of campaigns into Italy and the West where he had determined upon making a permanent settlement. He took with him his wife and children, the families of the warriors, and all the treasures and spoil which he had gathered together in Greece and Illyricum. With these he marched from Belgrade up the valley of the Save by Laybach and the passes of the Julian Alps, and so into the Venetian plain, beneath the very walls of Aquileia, that ancient Roman colony and fortress that showed the foresight of the Roman senate and Emperors in its careful construction and admirable location. Here a battle took place in which the Roman army was disastrously defeated. Alaric did not stop to lay siege to Aquileia, declaring in the language of his predecessor, "that he warred not upon stones," but passing by this fortress, marched through Venetia to the strong city of Ravenna. Here he tarried for a year in a vain attempt to capture the city, and finally withdrew toward Milan. While besieging the city of Polentia, he was attacked by the forces of Stilicho and a bloody if somewhat indecisive battle was fought. Claudian states that the Goths were disastrously defeated, while Gothic historians claim that it was a victory for Alaric. In any case it was not a decisive victory, and Alaric, checked in his descent upon Rome, turned back in Macedonia and Greece. In 408, after the death of Stilicho, he again set out for Rome and thrice attacked the city which finally fell in 410 and suffered sacking at the hands of barbarians for the first time since Brennus.

After the sack of Rome, Alaric marched his forces to the south with the evident purpose of crossing over to Sicily and

Africa, thus to complete the conquest of the Empire of the West. He reached Reggio where he began the collection of ships for the passage. They, however, were dispersed by a storm and a portion of his troops that had already embarked perished. While tarrying there endeavoring to repair the damages done to his plans by the storm, he suddenly died, stricken doubtless with Roman fever. His faithful followers buried him in the channel of the rushing Busento which was turned aside from its course for this purpose.

After the death of Alaric his brother-in-law, Ataulfus, led the Visigoths along the Turanian coast, through the passes of the Alps, and thence into Gaul, destined never again to pass this mountain barrier back into the plains and vineyards of sunny Italy. Ataulfus seems to have been so far won over by contact with Roman law and civilization that he was unwilling to be the instrument of her destruction. By his Roman life and training he was doubtless convinced that the law and civilization of his adopted country were far superior to those of his own people. The historian Orosius tells a story of Ataulfus that carries out this interpretation. In pursuit of his new peace-policy he forms an alliance with Rome, promising to defend her against her enemies. As a counter pledge of good faith of the Emperor Honorius he is given in marriage Placidia, the sister of the Emperor and daughter of Theodosius the Great. This beautiful young woman, taken captive in the sack of Rome, in 410, since then had been kept a royal prisoner in the camp of the Goths and had formed a romantic attachment for the handsome and dashing young king of the Visigoths. But peace did not last for long. Ataulfus had negotiated for four years to bring about his marriage with Placidia. Only a year afterwards he was murdered by one of his servants and a representative of a rival house. Singeric was raised to the throne. He was in all probability a party to the assassination of Ataulfus, and proceeded to the destruction of any possible rivals by slaying the infant children of Ataulfus by a previous marriage. He ruled but seven days when he in turn was killed and was succeeded by the brave Walia, a worthy successor of Ataulfus, but probably no

relative of his. Walia finally received as a reward for his services to Rome a grant of land in Spain and the south of Gaul, countries then overrun and laid waste by swarms of Suevi, Alans and Vandals. He, like the Israelites, had to fight for his inheritance, if he would enter it. Notwithstanding all this, he succeeded in establishing a well-ordered kingdom on both sides of the Pyrenees, the capital of which was the city of Toulouse. During his reign the Suevi held the highland districts of the northwest, while the Basques maintained their independence in the rugged mountains of Navarre and Biscay. This marks the beginning of the first Visigothic kingdom. Later, its boundaries were extended northward to the Loire and south to the Mediterranean and Atlantic. For nearly one hundred years the kingdom was Gallic rather than Spanish.

Theodoric (418–431) followed Walia as king of the Visigoths. He was generally, like Walia, earnest in keeping faith with the Romans, but in this he had a difficult part to play. During his long reign his people wholly emerged from barbarism and became quite thoroughly Romanized in customs and laws. In 431, when Gaul and Spain, as well as Italy, were threatened with destruction by the swarthy snub-nosed troops of Attila, this brave old warrior, Theodoric, allied himself with the Romans against the common enemy and in this way was found with all his forces side by side with Aetius at the great battle of Chalons where he fell at the head of his troops while beating back the fierce onset of the Huns. Here, on the field of battle, possibly at midnight, "with his martial cloak around him" his trusty followers laid to rest Theodoric, the "warrior and civilizer."

Euric, the eldest son of Theodoric, was elevated to the vacant throne by the Visigothic warriors while still on the battle field, and reigned from 451 to 485. He extended the Gothic conquests to embrace all Spain save that portion occupied by the Suevi, and pushed the boundaries of his kingdom northward to the Loire. The work of civilization, well advanced by his father, went rapidly on, but the Arianism of the Goth interfered with the assimilation of the two peoples. His son and successor, Alaric II (485–507), was

compelled to enter into a struggle with Clovis and his sons for the possession of Gaul. This was really a religious war and was brought about by the action of the Catholic clergy of Aquitaine in sowing dissension among Alaric's subjects and appealing to the Franks for aid. The Arian Goth was forced to yield to the Catholic Frank. Alaric was killed in battle, and Toulouse, the Visigothic capital, was taken by the Franks. It was only by the intervention of Theodoric the Great that any territory north of the Pyrenees was saved to the Visigoths. The Ostrogothic army routed the combined forces of the Burgundians and Franks in a battle near Arles and slew thirty thousand of their warriors. This kept from the greedy hands of Clovis, Septimania, Provence and the Narbonnes district. The capital of the Visigoths was removed to Toledo and Visigothic activity henceforth confined itself to Spain. Following the disastrous conflict with the Franks, the Visigoths found themselves in a precarious condition. Their king was a mere child and during his long minority his kingdom was under the overlordship of his grandfather Theodoric. He lived but a short time after reaching his majority and with him perished the last of the Balt dynasty. The Visigoths had no longer any royal house from which to choose a king and this led to a dangerous independence on the part of the nobility, each influential leader aspiring himself to be king. They finally elected Theudis, a renowned warrior, to the vacant throne and he proved to be a most able ruler. From Theudis to Roderic there were twenty-three elective kings. Of these nine were deposed and seven murdered, showing what a turbulent and unsettled state of affairs the kingdom was in. The masters of Spain were not a very numerous tribe and were scattered thinly among masses of a subject population kept down by the power of the sword. Besides, the conquerors were weak because of the lack of any strong centralized power and the kings were kept in a constant struggle to maintain themselves among their proud and dissatisfied nobles. No wars were carried on for conquest. Religious strife was continuous and bitter. The inner organization of the Visigothic realm presents a changed picture from the

simple tribal organization of freemen such as we found before the migration. They had divided their conquests into districts following the old Roman boundaries of provinces and *civitates*. These were under the control of dukes or counts who were attended by a bodyguard of personal dependents called *bucellarii* or *saeones*, the one-time simple freemen, now raised to the rank of a lesser nobility. Over these dukes and counts the king had but little real control. There was a very small body of lesser freeholders wedged in between the official nobles and their sworn retainers. This was an organization very similar to the later feudalism, consisting of a servile population of Hispano-Roman blood held in subjection by a mere sprinkling of men-at-arms bound by oath to follow some great noble. The Goths were still governed by their own customary law, not yet reduced to written form. The Hispano-Roman population made use of the Theodosian code, one of the early collections of Roman law. While the kings of the Visigoths were generally weak and under the control of their warlike nobles, there were not lacking examples of able men who caused the royal power to be respected and who accomplished something towards the consolidation of the state. Perhaps the most powerful of these rulers was Leovigild who governed Spain from 572 to 586. He subdued the Basques and overthrew the last of the Suevian kings. Next, he undertook a campaign against his own rebellious nobility and executed, one after another, all the more unruly of the Visigothic chiefs. In their stead he appointed counts and dukes from among his own immediate followers whom he thought he could trust. He established his capital permanently at Toledo and there assumed something of the grandeur and state of the Roman Caesars. He re-issued the coin of the realm with his own inscription instead of having it as previously bear the name of the Roman emperors. He defeated the Franks in their attempt to snatch Septimania from Visigothic control. Some time before his death he induced the Visigoths to elect Recarred, his second son, as his colleague, and to salute him as king, thus securing his peaceful succession upon the death of his father, in 586. Recarred was a worthy son of his

father and was destined to set his mark upon the Visigothic kingdom no less firmly than Leovigild had done. The father had saved the state from anarchy by means of his powerful arm; the son started it upon a new and altered course of existence, and introduced a better element into its political and religious life by the great change which has been connected with his name, the conversion of the Visigoths to the orthodox faith.

Recared was the son of a Roman mother and had received from her a bias towards the orthodox belief, but he was politic enough to keep this to himself during his father's lifetime. Indeed, all the evidence goes to show that he was not a man of deep religious convictions, but he saw clearly that the only way the Visigothic state could ever be firmly established was by removing the barrier of religion that lay between the ruling and subject classes. He was himself convinced that the Arianism of the Goths was more a matter of race-pride than fanatical belief, and he, therefore, decided to lead the way, trusting that mild measures and cautious changes would lead his countrymen to follow in his footsteps. He declared himself a Catholic in 586 and received the blessing of his uncle, the Metropolitan of Seville. Nearly all his immediate followers, thereupon, took the same step while the aristocracy and the Arian episcopate shortly afterwards conformed to orthodoxy. The church on its side made the change easy by not insisting upon any new baptism of the converts. It was deemed sufficient for them to attend a Catholic place of worship and to receive the blessing of an orthodox priest. Thus within the space of two years the conversion of the nation was brought about in a peaceful manner by a cautious and unemotional statesman. From this time forth the church had great influence among the Visigoths and the Catholic bishops became the most powerful supporters of the crown. In fact, the Roman clergy soon became too powerful, having more members in the National assembly than the entire number of dukes and counts. They soon led the king into the persecutions of both Arians and Jews and brought in a new danger to the state.

During all this time the Gothic conquerors, always a minority, were losing that rough and martial vigor which so preeminently characterized them and which made their conquest possible, while they persistently refused full civic rights to the subject provincials. Thus there grew with ever widening marks of demarkation two distinct and separate classes, different in race, with no common rights and consequently no common interests. This unwelded mass was totally unfit to receive the shock of the Saracen onslaught. So when, in 711, that wave of fanaticism broke against the throne of "Roderick, the last of the Goths," the whole fabric of the state fell like a house of cards, and one lost battle by the silver waters of the Guadalete, where the German went down before the Saracen, and the crescent supplanted the cross, turned aside for seven centuries the course of Spanish history.

From this disastrous battle only remnants of the Visigoths, together with Roman and Spanish provincials, escaped and maintained their independence during the entire Moorish occupancy in the mountains of Asturias. Here the fires of adversity welded into one homogeneous mass Goth, Roman, and Spaniard; so the new Christian state which emerged from these mountains bears little trace of the Goth; and only now and then a name, and anon a fleck in the blue blood of some Spanish hidalgo, as was the case with Philip II, serves to keep alive the memory of those fair-skinned, chestnut-haired warriors of the Danube, who, conquering and to conquer, descended among the sunburnt populations of the South. It is only when we examine the language of modern Spain that we find the German ancestor.

When Stilicho was called upon to meet and turn back the Visigoths under Alaric from their descent upon Italy, he was compelled to call in his troops from the posts along the Rhine and the Danube and mass them against this danger threatening from the east. In this way almost the entire northern frontier of the western empire was left exposed, and whole troops of barbarians, who for some time had been casting envious eyes upon the vineyards beyond the Rhine, now came pouring into the empire. It would be useless to trace

here the fortunes of each one of these. I can only tarry for such as founded states and so helped in the making of modern Europe. Near the Goths, before they had deserted their old home on the Baltic for their sunnier one on the shores of the Black Sea, dwelt the Vandals, their kindred, who spoke the same language and used the same laws. They had also been converted to the same faith, that of Arian Christianity. Somewhat cruder, more cruel, and less soldierly than the gentleman-Goth were the Vandals, but they, nevertheless, like all their German kindred, were made after an heroic pattern. Very early in their history they moved southward into what is now Bohemia and, about 330 A. D., were decimated by the Goths. They entreated Constantine, Emperor of Rome, to allow them to settle as his subjects in Pannonia. Their request was granted and for more than half a century the Vandals were the obedient servants of the Roman Empire. They were here at the time of the battle of Adrianople. In the year 406, having become unsettled by reason of Alaric's example, they recrossed the Danube and, together with the Suevi and Turanian Alans, moved rapidly to the northwest through their old-time hunting grounds and, finding the Rhine frontier unguarded, crossed the river at Mainz and proceeded to ravage Belgic Gaul. Defeated by the Franks, they moved steadily southward and in the year 409 are found at the foot of the Pyrenees thundering at the gate of Spain. Here they met with no opposition and so ravaged without hindrance and without mercy Hither and Farther Spain. In 414 the Visigoths enter Spain and finally drive the Vandals southward where, at the invitation of Count Boniface, they cross over into Africa in 429 and begin the conquest of that "granary of Rome."

From this time on the history of the Vandals is but the biography of one man. This man was Gaeseric (Genseric), the illegitimate son of the old Vandal king Godigisclus. If we except the meteoric career of Attila, this man Gaeseric was for fifty years the foremost man in all Europe. Until he arose his nation can scarcely be said to have conquered an enemy. They were defeated by the Goths in Bohemia, the Franks on the banks of the Rhine, and generally worsted by

the Visigoths in Spain, so that when Gaeseric became king and led them into Africa, scarce 20,000 fighting men were left of the great confederacy of peoples which twenty-three years before left their homes in Pannonia. The bones of the rest were bleaching on the plains and in the mountain passes of Gaul and Spain. In ten years, by a series of unbroken victories, Gaeseric made himself master of Roman Africa and changed his defeated Vandals into an invincible army. It was to this barbarian that Carthage surrendered and the Roman soldier, who for seven hundred years had, as conqueror, looked out from her towers and countermarched upon her shores, now sadly departed, leaving at last to the foe the land which had been so rudely wrenched from Hannibal at Zama. In one year's time he converted his landsmen into sailors and he, who was dependent in 429, upon a renegade Roman nobleman for a passage across the Straits, now had the finest fleet on the Mediterranean. An incident of this period of naval activity was the sacking of Rome in 455. The emperor, Valentinian III, who had made peace with Gaeseric at the expense of his possessions in Africa, had been recently assassinated, probably at the instigation of the aged senator, Maximus by name, who was thereupon elevated to the purple and who compelled Eudoxia, the widow of the late emperor, to marry him. This beautiful woman, whose widow's weeds were scarce three weeks old, seemed not to have wished, at the age of thirty-three, for a husband of sixty-five, and in her extremity invited the Vandal king to come over and sever the newly made bonds. Gaeseric was no Don Quixote, but he was "spoiling for a fight" and eager for this pillage of the Eternal City. He graciously accepted this kind invitation and together with his yellow-haired giants set sail as the crow flies from Carthage to Rome. Here he found Maximus already dead, so, having no bonds to sever, he gave his immediate and undivided attention to hunting out and storing in his curved ships everything of value which could be found in the city. Thus, without a blow being struck by Roman citizens for their defence, the Vandal king spent a delightful fortnight in pillage and then, with his vessels laden with gold and silver, the

precious statues of the deified dwellers on the Palatine, and Roman citizens for slaves, sailed away for Carthage.

At home we find the Vandals settling down to an orderly life and rapidly adapting themselves to the new conditions by which they are surrounded. Immediately upon the conquest of Africa, Gaeseric confiscated the larger portion of the lands in accordance with the world-wide principle that to the victor belongs the spoil. To understand this Vandal settlement, it will be necessary to keep in mind the divisions of the Roman territory in Africa. Beginning with Zeugetana or the Pro-Consular province, the land about the city of Carthage, some hundred miles long by fifty wide, there lay to the south a much larger district, though not so fertile, called Byzacena; to the west of these lay Numidia, and still farther west the various divisions of Mauritania. Gaeseric settled his forces in Zeugetana, the most fertile of all the lands of Africa, bestowing upon each of his soldiers land in fee. This plan made of the Vandals a compact body that could be easily gathered together in time of danger. These he organized in groups or bodies of one thousand. He further confiscated all the best estates throughout Byzacena and large portions of Numidia and kept them for himself or bestowed them on his sons. Upon all these lands the native population still resided, but were reduced to the condition of slaves. The old-time owner was now a mere overseer and director of other slaves who tilled the soil and gathered in the harvest for a barbarian ruler. The humiliation of the native orthodox population was now complete. After the victorious Vandal hosts were provided for, there still remained a large portion of land of poorer quality, deemed undesirable by Gaeseric and his sons though in a fair state of cultivation, throughout Byzacena and Numidia, together with all of Mauritania and the Islands of the Mediterranean which had fallen into the hands of Gaeseric. These were left in the possession of the former owners, the provincials, who were free, but who bore all the burdens of taxation save military service. The lowest stratum of native population, the burgesses of towns and those who had small holdings of undesirable land, Gaeseric paid no attention to but left free

from all burdens. It thus came about that there were three classes of free population: the Vandals who formed the nobility and who bore all the military burdens, but paid no taxes; the provincials who bore all fiscal burdens but gave no army service; and the proletariat who were protected in their little holdings and paid nothing either in service or money. This liberality to the poor on the part of Gaeseric may have been due to contempt felt for so down-trodden and helpless a class but, whatever the motive, the resultant can have been nothing but good to those thus favored. The Vandal was ignorant of any far-reaching scheme of taxation like that made use of by the Roman and the heaviest burdens inflicted by him must have been light in comparison to those borne under the old régime. The minor details of government in the Vandal kingdom were still in the hands of trained Roman secretaries who, as a beaurocracy of office holders, administered the ordinary functions of their office as if no change had taken place.

Like almost every other Germanic nation, the Vandals had shared in that great process of religious change of which the bishop Ulfila was the most conspicuous agent. They had been converted to the Arian form of Christianity before setting out upon their long migration and had come into Spain with a complete hierarchy of priests and bishops. When they reached Africa, they had already been at feud with the orthodox for nearly a century and their hearts were hot with hatred against them. Indeed, it has been stated that the chief purpose in the heart of Gaeseric was the uprooting and destruction of orthodox Christianity. The Roman province of Africa was preeminently the home of theological passion and bigotry. Carthage was the seat of a great theological school. Hippo was the home of Augustine. The Donatist Controversy had raged for four generations and had not yet spent its fury. This was but a sorry place to look for either tolerance or pity. Gaeseric and his followers, when their arms had overthrown all opposition, began a persecution of the orthodox which was fierce and bitter. Many churches were burned or thrown down and the services of the orthodox clergy forbidden. To what

extent these persecutions really went it is now impossible to tell. There was probably very little actual loss of life and the martyr's crown was but sparingly bestowed. But the spirit of bitter hatred was fostered and the seeds of strife were destined to bear bloody fruit.

Before leaving Pannonia the Vandals had learned something of the arts of peace and now they rapidly lost, just as the Visigoths had done, much of their rudeness and barbarism; settled as they were among vastly more numerous provincials whose civilization was much superior to their own, they not only learned the cultivation of the soil, the raising of fruit, and the making of wine, but they also learned the effeminate and luxurious vices of the conquered peoples and in this way softened their own physical and moral fiber. In 477, one year after the fall of the Roman Empire of the West and fifty years after his succession, Gae-seric died and with him also passed away the greatness of the Vandals. He left to a degenerate son a kingdom with a full treasury, a fine fleet, and a palace adorned with all the treasures taken at the sack of Rome. But this kingdom was torn with religious dissensions and numerous revolts of the Moors, while the small Vandal force was unable to cope with the barbarian rulers of Spain and Italy. Fifty-seven years after the death of its founder the Vandal kingdom went to pieces before the onslaught of Belisarius, the famous general of Justinian, and Africa was for a time re-united to the Roman Empire. The Vandal, like the Ostrogoth, passed away and we search in vain for any trace of the bold German, save here and there a name mayhap. *The stubborn Arianism of the Vandals forbade amalgamation with the African provincials and their acts of persecution stirred up such hatred that the orthodox church, once victorious, blotted them from the face of the earth.*

In tracing the general history of the Goths I showed how the Ostrogoths were largely subdued by the Huns, when that people passed into Europe in 375 and were, by reason of vas-salage, forced to join them in their march against the Visigoths in Gaul and the forces of the Western Empire, now marshalled under the renowned old soldier Aetius. Thus,

they took an unfortunate part in the great battle of Chalons.

When the Hunnish power broke in pieces after the death of Attila, the Ostrogoths regained their independence in conflict with his sons and, after various wanderings to the north of the Alps, seemed to have settled themselves for a rest in the lands of Pannonia and the valley of the Danube. They went through the form of having this land granted to them by the Eastern Empire, as it had been previously granted in turn to the Visigoths and the Huns, both of which nations had deserted it to pass into Italy. Here for nearly fifty years the Ostrogoths played the same part as the Visigoths had played a century before. They marched to and fro in almost every conceivable relation of friendship and enmity with the Eastern Empire until, just as the Visigoths had done before them, they one day marshalled their forces and passed into the West. In one respect the history of the Ostrogoths is quite similar to that of the Vandals, in that it is little more than a biography of one man. In power to dominate the minds of others, in ready grasp of life's interests, and in ability to turn its chances to his own advantage there is a marked similarity between Gaeseric, the Vandal hero, and Theodoric, the Ostrogothic king and preeminently the great man of his time. And yet almost as striking are the points of contrast. In order in any way to comprehend the half century of Ostrogothic history subsequent to the death of Attila, it will be necessary to study the history and character of the one great man of the period, Theodoric.

Theodoric was born in the year 454, two years after Attila's death and upon the very day of the battle in which his father, Theodemir, succeeded in breaking the chains of bondage which bound the Goth to the Hun, by completely overthrowing Irnack, the youngest of the sons of Attila, with all his forces in the battle of Nidad. At the age of eight years, he was sent to Constantinople as a hostage of the Emperor Leo, where he learned to speak Greek and gained something of the polish of the courtly society of Constantinople, but, whether from lack of desire to learn, or more probably from lack of desire on their part to teach, he went back home at the age of seventeen without knowing

how to write. He had breathed for some ten years a classic atmosphere without having had born in him the love of letters. But he was a strong and manly youth who delighted his old father more by his beauty, strength, and stature, and ability to ride, shoot, and hurl the spear, than he ever could have done with learning. It was this barbarian outcropping in him together with the proud blood of the Amals which was seen to surge in his red cheeks that immediately won for him the hearty love and following of his warrior nation. Even if he did have a little of the Roman polish, he still kept his German heart. When, in 475, Theodoric, at the age of twenty, succeeded his father, he was summoned to the court of Constantinople where he was made a Roman patrician and consul, and given command of the Palatine troops. He was even adopted into the household of the Emperor and offered a princess of the royal blood to wife. Here he tarried for some seven years and forgot among the allurements of court and his struggles for supremacy with another Ostrogothic leader, who bore his name, the interest and necessities of his nation. He was recalled unto himself and his higher duties by an embassy from his own people whose numbers were at this time being thinned by famine, who said, "King, while thou art fattening on the feasts of the Greeks, thy people are dying of famine. For their interests and thine own, arise and return among us; for, if left to destruction, we will ourselves go forth and seek new lands." Roused by these reproaches, Theodoric decided to give up his pleasures and bickerings in the East and return to his own people. Pannonia now seemed too narrow and restrained for the Goths and Theodoric decided to act upon his long-cherished scheme of leading his own people to the Western Empire and snatching that historic land from the hands of Odoacer and his Herulian followers who had now established themselves as masters in Italy. Theodoric asked permission of Zeno to pass with his entire nation into Italy and, having wrested it from Odoacer, to hold the country for the Empire. This permission was most joyfully granted to him by the astute ruler of the East who was only too glad to be rid of his troublesome "son-in-arms," with-

out any great expense unto himself. In 488 the entire Ostrogothic nation, now numbering some 200,000 souls, set out under the leadership of their young king for the sunny and historic land of Italy. Living on their flocks and herds and hunting as they went, they marched for more than seven hundred miles, in the meantime fighting with Bulgarians and Sarmatians who had swarmed into the waste marshes of Hungary and Carniola, once populous, cultivated, and full of noble cities, and engaging in a desperate battle with the Gepids while up to their knees in a morass. Thus threatened with enemies on all sides, with winter approaching, and starvation staring them in the face, unable to turn back, they pushed on through the passes of the Julian Alps, where icicles hung upon their beards, and their clothes cracked with frost. Thus, having suffered inconceivable hardships, with half their numbers dead through warfare and the hardships of the journey, grim and gaunt, they poured into the Venetian plain.

It is now necessary to turn aside for a moment in order that we may become acquainted with the great antagonists of Theodoric who with a heterogeneous force of Heruli, Rugi, Tursilingi, and Italians awaited him. In 475 the last of the Caesars, Augustus, the son of the patrician Orestes, general of the Roman army, was elevated to the purple by the turbulent soldiery who had tried in vain to seat his father, Orestes, upon the throne of the Caesars. They had perhaps forced their commander but a short time previously into the paths of rebellion. So soon as they had completed this revolutionary act, they demanded the confiscation of one-third of the lands of Italy, this portion to be settled upon themselves in the same manner as the lands of Auvergne had been bestowed upon the Visigoths. This Orestes flatly refused to do, as he deemed himself the protector of the Italian people and could not be made party to their spoliation. This refusal was fatal to himself, to his son, and to the dynasty of the Caesars. The man of the hour had arrived in the person of Odoacer, son of Edicon, a minister of the great Attila, and chief of the Heruli, one of the minor German tribes, at this time serving as an officer in the army of Orestes. A singu-

lar anecdote is related of his youth. Having left his country with a small band of adventurers who were seeking service in Italy, he one day passed by the cell of St. Severinus, a bishop of much piety and influence, whose history forms a long and interesting episode in the troubled annals of the time. Odoacer entered the cell of this pious man to ask some directions or, mayhap, to receive the old man's blessing. He was a young man of immense proportions, and he was compelled to bow his head, and even to remain with head and shoulders stooped when on the inside. Regarding him with a penetrating glance, the saint seemed to be so impressed with his formidable and kingly appearance, that he declared in prophetic words, "Go to Italy, clad in thy poor and ragged sheep skins; thou shalt soon give greater gifts to thy friends." The young man treasured up the words of the pious bishop in his heart and remembered them at the proper moment. His martial stature and soldier-like appearance soon found for him a patron in the person of his father's colleague, the Pannonian Orestes, and a place in the body-guard of the Emperor, at that time stationed at Ravenna. In all the wars of the time Odoacer distinguished himself by his immense physical strength, his fearlessness, and the influence which such a character enabled him to exercise over his fellow-soldiers. At this crisis in the affairs of Orestes, Odoacer found himself among the Rugi, Seyri, and Tursilingi, German tribes closely related to his own. They were the men to whom Orestes owed most and who were now dissatisfied and turbulent. This cunning bidder for fortune's smiles now stepped forward and promised that if they would but follow him they should have the lands which they demanded and which had been refused them by their unworthy leader. The standard of revolt was raised and the barbarian mercenaries, largely recruited by their brothers from beyond the Alps, advanced against their former master. The struggle was a brief one. Orestes was a brave and skillful general, but he was totally unable to contend against the odds marshaled against him. He was captured and put to death and his powerless little son, who by his smallness of stature and beauty of person appealed to Odo-

acer, was dethroned, given a pension of six thousand pieces of gold, and sent to rusticate in a Campanian village, which received its name from the spendthrift Lucullus and had previously belonged to both Marius and Sylla. A subservient senate sent word to Zeno "that a single emperor was now sufficient for the whole of both Italy and Greece, and that they felt their personal safety entirely secure under the excellent protection of Odoacer." Zeno was flattered by this empty request and appointed Odoacer Patrician and general of Italy in his own name. Thus, the Empire of the West finally perished and a barbarian general who learned the art of war in the Roman army was recognized as ruler. It may justly be said of him that he cultivated the arts of peace and by a wise and humane policy went far toward the establishment of prosperity in troubled Italy. He kept his promise to his soldiers and gave them one-third of the lands of northern Italy, thus binding them firmly to his support. He entered into a successful treaty with the victorious Vandals in Africa and the Visigoths in Spain and Gaul.

Odoacer had been early made acquainted with the contemplated invasion of the Ostrogoths and had made ready his forces. Thus it was that Theodoric found a foeman in every way worthy of his steel. And on that Veronian plain which for years was white with the bones of the slaughtered, it was German that met German, and no quarter was ever asked or granted. It was only by reason of the reckless bravery of Theodoric and the fact that his people fought not for honor but for life, that the forces of Odoacer were finally defeated and that general was compelled to shut himself up in the strongly fortified city of Ravenna. Here he maintained himself for more than three years, in the meantime carrying on a devastating war. In March, 493, Ravenna finally capitulated. To accomplish this Theodoric entered into a treaty with Odoacer, in accordance with which they were to rule Italy jointly, perhaps as did the consuls in the days of the Roman Republic. Be this as it may, ten days afterwards at a banquet given by Theodoric in honor of his colleague, Odoacer, the latter was cut down by Theodoric's own hand, and so by an act of cowardly treachery, which

savors of the Court of Constantinople rather than of the free German forests, Theodoric was left sole ruler of the Western Roman Empire. Italy, Sicily, Dalmatia, and the lands to the north of the Alps owned him as their ruler. In this war the Ostrogoths and Visigoths began to unite and Visigothic auxiliaries fought in the army of Theodoric in Italy. When the Visigothic kingdom of Toulouse was overthrown by the Franks, in 507, the power of Theodoric was extended over a large portion of southern Gaul and Spain. When Alaric II died, Theodoric, his father-in-law, became guardian of his grandson Amalaric and preserved for him all his Spanish dominions. Thus, so long as Theodoric lived the Visigothic kingdom was practically united to his own dominion. He was, moreover, overlord of all the Germanic nations of Gaul and Germany except the Franks. Neither did he neglect the ordinary precautions of newly established monarchs, but followed a policy as old as the time of Solomon. He strengthened himself on all sides by forming or consolidating connections with the royal houses of the neighboring nations. His wife was a sister of Clovis, the great king of the Franks. Of his daughters, he gave one in marriage to Alaric, king of the Visigoths, another to Sigismund, king of the Burgundians. He married his sister to a son of Gaeeric the Vandal, and his niece to the Thuringian king. Thus the Ostrogothic dominion was again as great in extent and far more splendid than it ever was in the time of Ermaneric. But it was totally different in character. The dominion of Ermaneric was barbarian; that of Theodoric was civilized.

For three and thirty years from the fall of Ravenna the murderer of Odoacer gave to Italy a reign of wisdom, justice, and prosperity unexampled in the history of the centuries lying between the days of the Antonines and those of Charlemagne. Italy now for the first time was occupied by a barbarian *nation*, and not by a mere horde of hungry warriors, as in the case of Odoacer and his Herulian followers. The Ostrogothic nation had a history behind it with a fixed political system. In this way it brings out as never before into clear relief the primal differences between Roman and Germanic civil policy. It is here in the field of politics

where the true greatness of Theodoric's mind is displayed. His great physical prowess and personal bravery were the common gifts of the Germans, and were held in even greater degree by his Amal ancestors; his skill as a general was surpassed by his noble antagonist whom he so basely slew; but here in the field of politics, in his firm grasp of affairs, in true statesmanlike breadth of mind, in his powers of construction rather than destruction, he was unparalleled; and in the whole field of modern history, until we reach Napoleon, we fail to find his equal. "Let other kings," said he, "rejoice in ravaging cities and burdening themselves with huge spoils, but I wish my dominion to be such that vanquished nations shall only regret that they were not sooner made subject to it." But these Ostrogoths needed lands, and as each Italian city, especially in the north, had given up a third part of its territory to be distributed to the soldiers of Odoacer, and as this land was now left vacant by the destruction of its occupiers, the new-comers were provided for without further discommoding the Romans. But, although the Goths were thus made owners of a large portion of Italic soil, spoliation and oppression were entirely forbidden and the rights of property of the Roman population were recognized and fully enforced. The villas which had been deserted by their owners were now again occupied and the lazy, luxurious life of the Roman dilettante went uninterrupted on. While sojourning at the Imperial Court, Theodoric had discovered the true secret of Roman power which made the empire terrible even in her fallen fortunes; that was Law. Indeed, it is in Roman law where we discover all the elements of her iron strength; that which placed her preeminently above all the nations of antiquity: law, which tells every man what to expect and what is expected of him; and in this way gives, if not content, at least confidence, energy, and industry. Theodoric's was a two-fold position. He was national king of the Goths, and at the same time he was successor to the Roman Emperors of the West. In his capacity of ruler of his own people, he was now called upon, probably for the first time in their history, to administer and enforce among the Goths the laws of indi-

vidual property in land. More than this, he suppressed Gothic institutions centuries old which were opposed to the common weal in the new order of settled life. An example of this was the establishment of a new criminal code and the abolition of the old-time *wergild*. Two peoples, whose political ideals were radically opposed, now dwelt side by side and had one common ruler. Of these two peoples, the one was at least semi-barbarian, holding as a blood gift a rude but proper idea of justice and morality, and an altogether exaggerated love for personal freedom; the other, none of these, but law, the suppression of the individual and the elevation of the state, art, literature, commerce, agriculture, in fact all the physical and refining elements of a high but narrow civilization; the one with its barbaric instincts still vigorous had but recently adopted Arian Christianity; the other, with mixed blood and all the currents of native forces long since exhausted, had for centuries been clothed in the outward trappings of a trenchant orthodoxy without any of the spirit of Christ. I said one man ruled over these two antithetical nations. He had in a very high degree, as part of his bone and blood, all the national characteristics of the former; he had, as well, a very thin veneering of the showy parts of the latter, together with a reverence for Roman civilization and an abiding faith in the spirit of Roman law. This man Theodoric had, moreover, such a fund of common sense that he was able to formulate a code of laws which worked justice to both parties. The Goth was allowed such of his customs as were deemed not out of harmony with his present state or future welfare, but he for the first time, probably, submitted to a tax, as Theodoric made no distinction between Goth and Roman in this respect. Upon Roman civilization was engrafted an order, a justice, a freedom, and a morality, which were the Gothic contribution and which tended at least to the strengthening and up-building of the effete Roman provincial. The free Germanic assemblies were still continued to the Goths, and by their side there yet lived that proud but long since ridiculous Roman Senate; while over both the king held a firm hand and himself did all the governing. He placed the treasures

of Roman art under the care of the government officials. He rebuilt or founded baths, palaces, churches, aqueducts, to such an extent that the Gothic name has been given to a style of architecture. Rural industry was sedulously encouraged and agriculture thrived throughout Italy. The Pontine Marshes were drained, the imperial ports restored, and new cities everywhere sprang up. It is to this era that we owe the origin or revival of many among the renowned cities of mediaeval times. Then arose Venice, Ferrara, Aquileia, Chiusa, and Sienna, while Florence, Pisa, Genoa, Bologna, and Milan first gathered within their walls the mass of wealth and the treasures of beauty which will render them illustrious through all generations of time. Few indeed, if any, of these towns were actually founded by Goths. They were perhaps in every case founded by Greek or Roman fugitives. But it was the security and liberality of the reign of Theodoric which made their existence possible. Venice was indeed more indebted to this barbarian hero for her prosperity than to the fabled patronage of St. Mark. Again, the administration of the government was so economically carried on that in spite of the great expenditures for rebuilding ruined cities and demolished fortifications, the taxes were very considerably lessened. An active police by sea and land maintained the security of trade and property while life was protected as it had not been since the time of the Antonines. Theodoric was a conscientious Arian, but he was broad enough to see the political advantages of toleration. He was on terms of friendship with the pope and showed no violence to the Orthodox party. Any of his subjects, whether Goth or Italian, were permitted to adopt either form of faith. He granted equal privileges to the clergy of both communions and allowed religious liberty to the despised Jew. "We can not enforce religion," said he, "for no one is obliged to believe anything in spite of himself." He built many churches but he tore down none.

Thus, a barbarian gave back to Italy the prosperity which she had lost under the Emperors. Says Machiavelli, "Theodoric deserves the highest praise, for, during the thirty-eight years he reigned in Italy, he brought the country to

such a state of greatness that her previous sufferings were unrecognizable." We find here the birth hour of modern Italy. Modern European civilization would have been advanced five centuries had his work been allowed to stand and had after generations given their attention to adding to rather than tearing down the constructive work of this great man.

The results of Theodoric's administration were a gradual amalgamation of race and interest between the conquerors and the conquered, the general security and rapid increase of property throughout the peninsula, and the appearance of all those outward adornments which arise from and distinguish a period of national prosperity.

The last few years of Theodoric's life were rendered unhappy by a religious ferment which had its origin in the Eastern Empire. Justin I proscribed Arianism in his dominions and punished severely all who confessed this con-faith. Theodoric was in no way a bigoted Arian, but he looked upon this proscription as an indignity and attempted by negotiations to mitigate its severity. As a last resort he sent word to Justin that in case the persecution of Arians did not cease he would retaliate by a persecution of the Orthodox in his own realm. This had the desired effect but aroused the fears of his subjects, some of whom entered into a conspiracy against his life. Among the number arrested and charged with this crime were the Patriarch of Rome, Symmachus, a trusted counsellor, and the philosopher Boethius. These were convicted and put to death in 524. While in prison awaiting his execution, Boethius wrote his celebrated work, *The Consolation of Philosophy*. It is altogether probable that remorse for the execution of the philosopher and his father-in-law, Symmachus, whose innocence was afterwards made clear to him, unseated the mind of Theodoric and hastened his death, which took place in 526, in his seventy-third year.

After Theodoric's death, the supremacy wielded by his nation over the barbarian world disappeared. The union between Ostrogoths and Visigoths came to an end. The Ostrogoths made Athalaric, the grandson of Theodoric, by

his daughter Amalasuntha, their king, while the Visigoths raised Amalaric, the son of that Alaric who fell in conflict with Clovis in 507, to the throne, and henceforth that kingdom won its way to independent renown. Athalaric was but a sickly child when he came to the throne and his mother, as guardian, was associated with him in the rule. The ambitious rivalries among the nobles now destroyed the last vestige of union, while the Court at Constantinople continually intrigued to fan these dissensions into flame. Ostrogothic power rapidly fell to pieces during this reign. In 534, the boy-king died after a brief life of self-indulgence and idleness. His mother undertook the government alone, but later associated her nephew Theodohad with her in the sovereignty. This proved to be a very unfortunate arrangement, as the nephew immediately intrigued to obtain the sole rule and finally accomplished his purpose by assassination. Frightful anarchy ensued in which rapine and murder were daily occurrences.

In the meantime Justinian had become Emperor of the East and had revived for a time the name and fortune of Rome. A transitory gleam of splendor flashed across the destiny of the fallen empire. Again were the imperial eagles borne to victory. Belisarius, the renowned general of Justinian, in one rapid and brilliant campaign overran the whole Vandal territory and crushed that kingdom forever. The weakness and anarchy existing in the Ostrogothic kingdom now fired Justinian with the ambition of extending his dominion over the Empire of the West. For this purpose he sent Belisarius and his victorious army into Italy. And now begins that terrible Gothic war which was to leave Italy once more a heap of ruins and which was to tax the strength and skill of both those famous generals, Belisarius and Narses. Finally, in 552, after nearly twenty years of the most desperate conflict in all the annals of war and after their heroic kings had fallen as became them sword in hand on the field of battle, the Goth was almost annihilated and another splendid Germanic kingdom came to an end. More than this, a powerful people disappeared from the world's history. Says Sheppard, "A great people, which had or-

ganized an enlightened government, and sent 200,000 fighting men into the field of battle, is annihilated and forgotten. A wretched remnant, transported by Narses to Constantinople, were soon absorbed in the miserable proletariat of a metropolitan city. The rest fell by the sword, or were gradually amalgamated with the mixed population of the peninsula." . . . "They disappeared, those brave Teutons, out of whom, welded with the Latin race, son noble a people might have been made to cultivate and defend the Italian peninsula. They were swallowed up in we know not what morass of Gepid, of Herulian, of Slavonic barbarism." This kingdom, judged by almost any standard, was worthy of life more by far than some that have outlived it one thousand years. It was rent, however, by terrible religious strife and "A kingdom divided against itself cannot stand."

At the close of the long and bloody war with the Goths when life had again settled down to its accustomed burden-bearing, the Greek and Roman population which had been fostered by Theodoric and whose battles had been fought by his followers, but who were still far from being satisfied, now, at last, when it was forever too late, realized that the smile of Providence had been upon them. After the fall of the Goth, the conqueror Narses was made governor of Italy with the title of Exarch, and with his residence at Ravenna. He proceeded in the name of his master, Justinian, to crush the life out of the people by a taxation nothing short of robbery; this, on the ground that the expenses of the terrible war had been incurred in their behalf, and it was only justice that they should pay them. In 565, after the death of Justinian, the discontent of the people rose to an alarming height and it was thought best to recall Narses. A thoughtless and silly woman turned this recall into an insult which it was not in human nature to forgive. "Bid him leave to men the exercise of arms, and resume his proper place, distaff in hand, among the women of the palace," was the message sent to Narses by the empress. We wonder not at the answer, "Tell her I will spin her such a thread as she shall not easily unravel." Thereupon he sent word to the Lombards then dwelling in Pannonia, that if they chose to

come across the Alps into Italy, he would not stand in their way. This invitation was readily accepted and the nation took up its march and overran the valley of the Po. After a siege of three years the great city of Pavia at last surrendered and became the capital of the Lombard kingdom, as Ravenna had been that of the Gothic, some seventy-five years before. Italy was easily subdued this time as the war with the Goths had exhausted her resources. All the central, inland portion of Italy quickly fell into the hands of the Lombards, while the seacoast generally remained to the Romans. The Exarchate of Ravenna, Rome, the coast of Liguria and Venice, together with all the southern part of the peninsula and the islands, were never conquered by the Lombards. The Greek Empire retained all these, and they were governed by an exarch who lived, as Narses had done, at Ravenna.

These new conquerors of Italy were Germans like the Goths before them, and so continued the common Germanic institutions which had been planted by Theodoric. But the Lombards, though Germans, were little like the Goths in other respects; they seemed to be coarser grained and hence more brutal, more like the Saxons to whom they were nearly related. Their own legends represent the tribe as coming from Scandinavia and settling upon the shores of the Baltic Sea where they are located by the Romans in the second century, in close proximity to the Saxons, but on the left bank of the Elbe. In the latter part of the sixth century they are found dwelling on the banks of the Danube, already more than half Christianized. How they reached this territory and by whom Christianity was introduced among them, we know little. They were Arians like their neighbors, and like the Goths carried with them into Italy a hierarchy of priests, bishops, and deacons. Here on the banks of the Danube they repeated the history of the Goths. For a time they were on good terms with the empire and furnished soldiers for many campaigns. They overthrew the Heruli, to whom they were subject for a time, and then utterly destroyed the Gepidae who had settled in Attila's old home after his death. Moving gradually westward, they finally took pos-

session of Pannonia where for some forty years prior to their passage of the Julian Alps they made their home. In the history of the Vandals and the Ostrogoths we found that in each case one man formed a center and Vandal and Ostrogothic history became little more than biography. There was nothing of this in the case of the Lombards. Alboin, who was their king when they passed into Italy, was distinguished from his fellow-countrymen only by an excess of brutality. Only two acts of his are recorded by the national historian Paul. When in battle with the Gepidae he slew their king, Cunimund, with his own hand and forced Rosamond, his beautiful daughter, to marry him. This was barbarism only; Theodoric would have done as much. He had a silver-mounted drinking-cup made out of the old king's skull, from which on festal occasions he and his warriors quaffed large draughts of wine in celebration of their feats of arms, even as Odin's warriors were wont to do in the heavenly banqueting hall. On one occasion he bade his attendants fill with wine the skull of Cunimund and bear the cup to his own wife, the daughter of the slain king, the lovely Lombard queen, compelling her to drink therefrom. This was sheer brutality. The Goth was barbarous, but with the instincts of a gentleman; the Lombard was barbarous, with the instincts of a cruel beast. Alboin was soon assassinated at the instigation of his outraged wife and was followed by Clef, a man fully as cruel as his predecessor. He very soon became intolerable to a proud nobility, who deemed themselves the equals of their monarch on the field of battle, and scarcely his inferior in birth or social rank, and was murdered at their instigation. Throughout their whole history as an independent nation the Lombards produced no great man and, instead of being weakened thereby, it was undoubtedly the main cause of their becoming attached to Italian soil and making a large factor in the subsequent history of Italy. The Lombard chiefs were a turbulent set and had not respect enough for their king to sink their own individuality in his, nor did that king have power enough to crush them. We find the nation, therefore, almost immediately upon their arrival in Italy divided into thirty-six dukedoms

or counties, each one under a ruler who was practically independent and who thus became personally attached to the soil, and as owner interested in its welfare. The Germanic national assembly, which lost all its power in the hands of Theodoric, here kept its full force and made the king subject to its decisions. Thus the people kept up a healthful interest in polities while at the same time they rapidly became attached to the soil. After the death of Clef, they elected no successor for a space of ten years, but formed rather a loose confederacy, each duke being for the time entirely independent and making war on his own account either upon the subject population which he robbed, or upon some neighboring Lombard duke. Thus we have repeated on Italic soil a picture of earlier Germanic customs, complete in all particulars save that of private landholding. This element was new.

But this loose confederacy was not the thing to protect the Lombard from the dread of Byzantine intrigue, Frank intervention, or the jealous interference of the Roman pontiff. The political perceptions of the various dukes were quickened by these dangers and the knowledge gradually filtered in, that disunion was death. After an interval of ten riotous years, in 584, they re-established the office of king and elected thereto Autharis, the son of Clef, who was a minor at the time of his father's death. In engaging to follow his banner to the war, they agreed to a surrender of one-half of their annual revenue for the purpose of furnishing a body of troops which would be at the king's disposal at all times. This supplied the nucleus of a standing army and greatly strengthened the central power. In return for this concession on the part of the nobility the king made the various holdings of the dukes independent and hereditary, revertible to the crown only upon the failure of heirs. Thus, we see the seeds of feudalism sown throughout Italy. The vanquished population sunk to the condition of tributaries and were obliged to pay to their conquerors one-third of the products of the fields which they retained. Their condition was much inferior to what it was during the Ostrogothic dominance. Autharis was active during his brief

reign in establishing peace and security, and strengthening the central government against the outside enemies. But he really made little headway in curbing the restless and independent spirits of his Lombard nobility, who had the controlling power in the national assembly, and so made the laws which they afterwards administered among their neighbors and dependents to suit themselves. The Lombards were Arians, and continued for some time to hold faithfully to this confession, but Autharis had married an orthodox princess, Theodolinda, who by her beauty and lovable character had unbounded influence, not only over her husband, but also over the Lombard chiefs. When Autharis died while yet a young man, his youthful widow was allowed to choose a second husband whom the nobility swore to make their king. Her choice fell upon Agilulf, duke of Turin. Through his wife's influence this new king accepted the orthodox faith and the whole nation was gradually won over from their Arianism to orthodoxy. How much of this conversion was a mere matter of policy, it is impossible to say. Rotharis, who succeeded to the throne in 615, upon the death of Agilulf, was thoroughly Orthodox. He had the distinction of giving to the Lombards their first written laws which were but a careful compilation of customary law. In a Diet, held in Pavia in 643, the king made this written code known by proclamation and further said, "They are the laws of our fathers, as far as we have learned them from ancient men, and are published with the counsel and consent of our princes, judges, and all our most prosperous army, and are confirmed according to the custom of our nation by garathinx," i. e., by giving an earnest, or warrant, of the bargain. These Lombard laws were simply a compact between king and people and were in this respect like all early English laws save that they were territorial rather than personal, and bound Lombard and Roman alike. They were written in Latin and in this way became a notice to the Roman of the usages and rules of their conquerors. The Roman must have felt some contempt for so rude a legal code, after having followed for so long the guidance of that consummate jurisprudence which Justinian had codified. Perhaps the Lombard was

justified in thinking that laws which were good enough for him were also good enough for persons whom he could conquer. The kingdom of the Lombards lasted for more than two hundred years, from Alboin (568) to the fall of Desiderius (774), but it differed from the other Germanic conquests whose history we have traced in that it was never complete as to territory. Throughout this entire time there were three capitals: the Lombard one, Pavia; the Latin one, Rome, and the Greek one, Ravenna. Luitprand, the only king after Rotharis worthy of mention, tried to complete the conquest of the peninsula, but failed to gain access to the sea and at the same time stirred up an enemy destined to become more powerful than any barbarian leader that ever unfurled his banner on the soil of Italy. Through the influence of Leo, who was able to turn back the conquering hordes of Attila, and Gregory the Great, who now took advantage of every favorable opportunity to push forward the claims of St. Peter, the Roman Church began to show that energy and aggressiveness which was destined to make it the triumphant power in Europe. It was this that forced Luitprand to withhold his hand when at the very gates of the "Eternal City," and to prostrate himself before the pontiff's chair. It was the church that summoned the Frank to her aid in her struggle with the Lombard which marks the beginning of the end of Lombard rule in Italy.

During the two-hundred years of their sojourn in Italy a change had come over the Lombard character. "Intestine seditions, and the enervating influence of a warmer climate, had deteriorated the rude energies of that race whom Tacitus distinguishes for valor and hardihood amid their Teutonic brethren, and who, two hundred years before, descended under the banners of Alboin, like sons of the giants, upon the fair cities and fertile plains of Italy, determined to make them the booty of their bow and spear. But now they could offer no effectual resistance to men who brought with them from behind the mountains a fresher importation of the same old heroic blood." In the north of Italy the influence of the Lombard was profound, while in turn the influence of the Italian, by daily contact, completely transformed

his conqueror. However, the races never overcame their mutual antipathy and never amalgamated until the Frankish conquest made them both subject. The influence of this Germanic strain is plainly discernible to-day in the physical characteristics of the dwellers in the valley of the Po and throughout the inland and northern portions of the Italian peninsula.

## CHAPTER XXII

### THE FRANKS FROM CLOVIS TO CHARLEMAGNE

IN our rapid sketching of the main Germanic tribes that left the fatherland for new homes in the south or the west, we have now reached the Franks, who in some respects at least must be considered the most important of all. When their history begins, the Franks appear in two great sub-confederacies or groups, mostly on the west bank of the Rhine, from the neighborhood of Mainz northward and westward to the sea, but reaching also east of the Rhine to the Yssel. In the middle of the third century they had spread themselves over the greater part of northern Gaul and were known by the names of Ripuarii, occupying the country between the Rhine and the Meuse, and the Salii, upon either side of the Rhine, eastward to the Yssel and westward to the Scheldt. The Ripuarii, in all probability, derived their name from the fact of their dwelling upon the banks of the Rhine and Meuse, while the Salii were doubtless named from the Yssel, the most northern of the branches by which the Rhine flows westward into the German ocean. At the time of Attila's invasion, in 451, the Franks are firmly established, the Salii, with their capital at Dispargum, and the Ripuarii, with their capital at Cologne, while they unite in friendly intercourse with the empire and are frequently found fighting in the ranks of the Roman army, just as Goths, Vandals, Heruli, Lombards, and even Huns, had done before them. They were pretty generally allied with the Romans and Visigoths against the Huns in the great battle of Chalons, in 451, although they were also found in the ranks of the mixed host of Attila. Of the two great families, the Salii early developed the greater strength. This was apparent early during the leadership of their young chieftain Clovis (Hlodwig, Ludovicus, or Louis) when they became masters of

northern Gaul, while the Ripuarii were still hemmed in between the Meuse and the Rhine. Clovis began to rule the Salian Franks in 481, when but fifteen years of age. He succeeded to his father, Childeric, who was the hero of many a strange Frankish saga and who had, twenty-four years earlier, followed his father, Merovich, who was fabled to have sprung from a semi-god, or sea-monster, thus furnishing to his descendants the proper god-like ancestry. It is from this grandfather of Clovis that the well-known name of Merovings was derived. This story well illustrates the youth of the heathen nation which this young ruler was destined to lead to victory and greatness. It was still lingering in the dim mists of mythology.

Under Clovis the Franks may be said to begin their long career of conquest, by overthrowing, in 486, the Roman power which was at that time marshalled under the command of Syagrius, in the battle of Soissons. By this battle they extended their boundary to the river Loire, which at that time marked the northern limit of the Visigothic kingdom, and snatched from the palsied hand of Rome the last of her possessions north of the Alps and west of the Rhine. In this manner all Gaul, that had been won by the statesmanship and genius of Julius Caesar with so much toil and bloodshed nearly five hundred years before, now fell under the dominance of Germanic peoples, the Franks, Burgundians, and Visigoths. Five centuries of Roman dominance and Roman civilization thus came to an ignoble end. It was here in this battle with Syagrius at Soissons that occurred the incident of the vase which is related by Gregory of Tours, and which admirably illustrates the nature of Clovis. At the request of a bishop, Clovis had desired to reserve, over and above his own share of the booty, a valuable vase which was part of the sack of a church. All the soldiers save one gave their willing consent to this request, but he, raising his battle axe, struck the vase a blow, at the same time crying out: "Thou shalt only have what the lot accords thee." The king seemingly paid no heed to this affront but took the battered vase and restored it to the church. At the review of his army which took place the following year, when he came to him

who had struck the vase, Clovis reproved him for the ill condition of his weapons and, instead of restoring them to the owner, flung them upon the ground. When the latter stooped to recover them, Clovis clove his skull in twain with a double-handed blow of his battle-axe, exclaiming as he did so: "Thus didst thou with the vase at Soissons." That crafty, cruel cunning which could patiently wait a year for its opportunity and in the meantime never for one moment forget either the offered affront or the intended retaliation, showed a savage barbarity equal to the red man of the American forest. The incident also revealed a strange mixture of absolute power and restrictive rights on the part of the Frankish royalty. Clovis receives out of all the spoil nothing save what the lots allow him as an equal among freemen. At the same time he cleaves the head of one of those freemen without any judgment of his peers and nothing whatever is said about it; rather the act would seem to have strengthened his hands.

By the overthrow of Syagrius, Clovis at once obtained possession of Picardy, and a considerable portion of Lorraine. This was indeed a mighty stride toward the possession of all Gaul and was accomplished by Clovis when only twenty years of age. After history proved that his people thoroughly understood and appreciated the immense importance of this conquest. It became the head of the Frankish dominion. Immediately upon its conquest Clovis removed his capital from the old Salian town of Dispargum to the newly acquired Roman city of Soissons, and thence in a few years to Lutetis, a small mud-built town of a Celtic tribe known by the name of Parisii, whence came the name of Paris. For the next ten years the young king occupied himself in strengthening his hold upon northern Gaul. He was involved in a struggle with the Thuringians and Alamanni, Germanic peoples dwelling, the one on the left bank of the Rhine, the other in the region now known as Suabia. In 493, he defeated the Thuringians and drove them back to their forests. But this year was specially characterized, not so much by this victory, as by his marriage to Clotilda, the niece of Gundobad, king of the Burgundians; an event which was to

turn the whole current of his life and be a chief cause of the ascendancy of the Frankish kingdom. To understand how so much importance could attach to the marriage of a man who already had at least one wife and a son to succeed him in case of his death, we must call to mind the fact that all the Germanic peoples hitherto Christianized had been converted to the Arian form of Christianity. Clotilda was a Catholic although her people were Arians, and it was through her instrumentality that Clovis and his followers were converted from heathenism to the Catholic faith. The Franks thus became a tower of strength to the Church at Rome at a time when her supremacy was trembling in the balance. In 496, the Alemanni, no doubt thinking that they would like to share in the country being so rapidly conquered by the Franks, crossed over the Rhine and made an attack upon the Ripuarii. These people were not able to defend themselves alone and in their extremity called upon Clovis to come to their aid. This he hastened to do and, with the combined forces of the Ripuarii and Salii, engaged the enemy in a fierce battle near Strassburg (Tolbiacum or Lulpich). It would seem that the tide of battle was running against the Franks when Clovis, who had at divers times been entreated by his wife to become a Christian, and who was in all probability already half convinced, in the extremity of his danger now turned to this new source of strength. Lifting his tear-streaming eyes to Heaven he cried: "O Jesus Christ, whom Clotilda affirms to be Son of the Living God, and who art said to give victory to them that trust in Thee; if Thou wilt grant me the victory over these mine enemies, I will believe and be baptized in Thy name. For I have called upon my own gods and had no help from them, wherefore I believe that they have no power." The Franks were victorious in the struggle and Clovis faithfully fulfilled his vow. He was baptized on Christmas Day, 496, and some three thousand of his followers followed his example. We can hardly suppose that a souse in the river while a white-robed priest read the Latin ritual over them had much effect upon the hearts and conduct of these crude barbarians, and yet it would be difficult to overestimate its value. The baptism of Clovis by

Bishop Remigius proclaimed him a champion of the Catholic faith against that Arian form of Christianity which was, as I have previously said, dominant among the other Germanic invaders of the Roman Empire. The Vandal in Africa, the Ostrogoth in Italy, the Burgundian in the valley of the Rhone, and the Visigoth in Spain and Aquitaine were all upholders of what the orthodox denounced as the "Arian pravity." The conversion of the Franks under the alliance thus formed really shaped the whole future history of Europe. The conversion of Clovis soon bore fruit for the church. He was stirred up by his wife to avenge the insults that her uncle, Gundobad, king of the Burgundians, had heaped upon her house. The desire of personal revenge was now further strengthened by the hope of making the whole of Burgundy Catholic. Consequently the entire Frankish clergy were active partisans of Clovis. In the year 500 he marshalled his forces against Burgundy. At this time there were two kings in Burgundy, Gundobad, who ruled at Lyons, and Godegisel, his brother, who ruled at Geneva. Godegisel seems to have entered into an alliance with the Franks against his brother but was in the end defeated and slain. The forces of Clovis won an easy victory over Gundobad at Dijon, and forced him to pay tribute and, thereafter, to hold his kingdom as a part of the Frankish dominion. Equal privileges were granted to Catholics and Arians and, in this way a large party, which deemed its own interests best served by the Franks, was secured among the Burgundians. This led, in 534, to a complete conquest of the Burgundian people and a union of interests which made them henceforth one with the Franks. But Clovis wisely restrained himself from any such movement at the time of his victory and left a national king on his throne. He pushed on into Provence, ravaged it and gave it to Theodoric, the ruler of the Ostrogoths, with whom he was at this time on terms of alliance.

After making peace with Gundobad and leading his army home, Clovis began to cast longing eyes toward the Visigothic kingdom where Alaric II now ruled. Here he had the same pretext for attack and the same means of success which were his in his struggle with Burgundy. The Visigoths were Ari-

ans and as such were at enmity with the bishops of southern Gaul, who were all Catholics. The latter looked to Clovis as their champion and were only too glad to see trouble brewing between Alaric II and the king of the Franks. Alaric protested, in a council held in 506, that he had no desire whatever to oppress the bishops or persecute the Catholics, and his actions were in accord with these words; but trouble was nevertheless bound to follow when the Catholic clergy throughout Aquitaine were only seeking for a pretext to call in the Frankish swords to crush Arianism, while Clovis, on his part, was but waiting a suitable opportunity to add southern Gaul to his other possessions. In 507, he assembled his leading chieftains and said to them: "It displeases me that these Arians should possess a portion of the Gauls; march we forth with the help of God, drive we them from that land, for it is very goodly, and bring we it under our own power." The Frankish chieftains applauded their king and the army forthwith set out on the march toward Poitiers, where Alaric was at that time encamped. Miraculous signs and portents seemed to have pointed out, to the pious recorder of his exploits, Clovis as the hero of the true faith who was to free a people from the burden of the heretic. A white doe, says Gregory of Tours, pointed out the ford in the river Dienne, while a meteor illumined the Frankish camp and lighted up the way. Thus piloted on his way by divine messengers, Clovis led his army safely to the plain of Vouille, not far from Poitiers. It is here that Alaric prepared himself as best he could for the struggle and the two armies met in a closely contested battle. Clovis with his own hand slew Alaric in a personal encounter. The Goths, upon the death of their king, fled in disorder and Clovis passed on to Bordeaux where he went into winter quarters; early the next spring he marched with his entire forces to Toulouse which offered no resistance. Here he found a portion of the treasure of the Visigothic kings. From this place he hastened to the siege of Carcassonne, which was the old Roman stronghold of Septimania. Here his conquest ended. Theodoric sent an Ostrogothic army over the Alps to aid their kinsmen in their struggle with the Franks. The latter were defeated

in a battle near Arles and forced to retire beyond the Loire. Thus Spain and southern Gaul (Gallia Narbonensis and Provence) were saved to the Visigoths. Clovis gained by this campaign all of Aquitania, and before going home, halted at Tours and organized his new territory.

While there at Tours he was flattered by receiving from Anastasius, Emperor of the East, an embassy bringing him the titles and insignia of Patrician and Consul of Rome. Donning, in the Basilica of St. Martin, the purple tunic and chlamys of a Roman senator, Clovis rode through the streets of the old Roman city scattering largesse among the crowd. The letter of Anastasius was the first of a long series of courtesies which passed between the Roman Emperors and the orthodox kings of the Franks. At a later time they assumed a tone far other than flattering. On leaving Tours he returned to Paris where he established his capital. This remained the political center of his dominions, the intermediate point between the early settlements of his race and his new Gallic conquests. Here he remained, giving the next few years of his life to the organization and consolidation of his vast domain. By rapid conquest he had added to the modest little territory about Tournai, which he had received from his father, the entire kingdom of Syagrius, Burgundy, and Aquitaine.

While Clovis had busied himself with the acquisition of these outside territories, the Frankish power at home was divided among several puppet kings, making thus but a loose confederacy. It was impossible for Clovis long to content himself with this condition of affairs; he was too powerful and too ambitious to remain long in the position of a mere partnership-king. His first step toward consolidation was to sweep away the petty kings of the Salian Franks. Ragnachar, who remained at Cambrai, was a relative of Clovis and had given him valuable help in his struggle with Syagrius, but when the time came for removing him he was forced into a one-sided contest with Clovis, defeated, and then put to death for disgracing the royal family by permitting himself to be beaten. Chararic, another Salian king, was captured by deceit, shorn of his long locks, and turned into a

priest, while his son was at the same time ordained a deacon. Later these two were put to death because the son was reported to have given comfort to his father with the saying that "leaves might yet sprout forth from their lopped branches." Lastly Sigibert, king of the Ripuarii, who had been the ally of Clovis in his war with Alarie, had to be disposed of. Clovis here made use of a most dastardly artifice in order to gain his end. Sigibert was well advanced in years and was lame by reason of a wound received while aiding Clovis in his wars of conquest. He had a son, Cloderic by name, a young and ambitious man. Clovis sent a secret messenger to this young man, saying: "Thy father hath become old and his wound causeth him to limp on one foot; if he should die, his kingdom will come to thee of right together with our friendship." Thus incited Cloderic had his father assassinated while he slept in his bed, and immediately sent messengers to Clovis carrying the news to him, and asking that he send envoys to receive a portion of the treasure of the late king. These were sent and while going through the form of examining the treasures, they clove the skull of the young king with a battle-axe. Clovis now went to Cologne and called an assembly of the Ripuarii. Before this august body he denied most emphatically that he was in any way responsible for the death of their king, and advised them to elect him to the vacant throne. This they did in accordance with their usual custom. Clovis now turned his attention to the other minor tribes and by like strategy and murder succeeded in removing his last rival, in this way consolidating the entire power of the Franks. His methods were barbarous, and it is doubtful whether Clovis was ever anything but a barbarian at heart: His many murders seemed never to have disturbed his peace of mind, and the spilling of blood never deterred him from carrying out his policy of self-aggrandizement and unification. But we must not judge him by our own standards. Murder has ever been looked upon by primitive peoples as an offense easily condoned, and the Germanic laws revealed the fact that cowardice was a far greater offense in the eye of the German than was the taking of life. There can be no doubt but Clo-

vis accomplished a great work for his people and laid the foundations for the supremacy of France in European affairs. Still we can scarcely restrain a smile when we read the words of the pious Gregory of Tours: "Thus did God daily deliver the enemies of Clovis into his hands because he walked before His face with an upright heart."

Clovis lived but a few years after completing his work of unification. He died November 27, 511, at Paris and was buried in the Church of St. Peter and St. Paul, built by his wife, Clotilda, who survived him. He left four sons among whom his great kingdom was divided after the manner of private property. If Clovis was a strong lion, as the "*Gesta Francorum*" has it, now began the reign of the leopards, the bears, and the wolves, the dogs and the jackals. Certain it is that he was followed by no man worthy of being his successor. His children inherited his cruelty with little or none of his ability. For more than two hundred years, from 511 to 752, when the Merwings ceased to rule, there really is nothing which we may call history; only a chaos of plotting and fighting and murder in which twenty-eight so-called kings took part in turn, only to pass down and justly be forgotten.

The time had now arrived when France must shake herself free of the sloth and inaction which had taken possession of her kings. A certain amount of good sense and practical efficiency must be the portion of that person who would rule even barbarians. When this endowment is wanting in rulers, the nation or community seeks elsewhere for these qualities, for without them government is impossible. The Merwing rulers at last drove the Frankish people to this extremity. They found the qualities they were looking for in a family descended in the one line from Pippin of Landen, in the other from the saintly Arnulf, Archbishop of Metz, and upon them they bestowed the real government of the nation while the shadow-kings but rode in now and then to the palace or assembly from their country home to wear the foolish trappings of a power which had long since deserted them. The family of Pippin was a wealthy and aristocratic one which was high in ecclesiastical affairs and furnished sev-

eral bishops to the church. This union with the church was of great value to the Mayors of the Palace, as it gave the influence of the clergy to Austrasia rather than Neustria in the struggle which culminated in the battle of Testry. Pippin of Heristal, the grandson of Pippin of Landen, now ruled over all the Frankish dominions with the title of Duke of Austrasia. The annals of the reign are very meager, but we can glean from them at least three important acts that were performed during his sway of twenty-seven years. He struggled without cessation to keep or bring back, under the rule of the Franks, the Germanic nations on the east side of the Rhine, the Frisians, Saxons, Thuringians, Bavarians, and Alamanni. He rekindled in Austrasia the national spirit and some political activity by summoning again the old folk-moot or national assembly which the early Merwings had allowed to perish. Lastly, he understood fully for France the importance of the conversion to Christianity of the Germanic peoples beyond the Rhine and he, therefore, aided with all his might the zeal of the popes and missionaries who were devoted to this work. This last was probably the most praiseworthy of all his undertakings. At the time of his death, which occurred in 714, Pippin went far to undo what he had accomplished during his lifetime. He had two wives, Plectrude and Alpaida. It would seem that he had repudiated the former in order to marry the latter and that, too, without the sanction of the church. By canon law this latter marriage was illegal and children born of this union would be incapable of inheriting after the father. By his first marriage he had two sons, Drogo and Grimwald. Drogo died of a fever, in 708, and was laid to rest in the basilica of his sainted ancestor, Arnulf, at Metz. Grimwald was assassinated at the Church of St. Lambert in Liége, where he had stopped to pray while journeying to visit his father who lay sick at Jupille. Grimwald left one son, a child some six years of age. Pippin was exceedingly fond of this little grandson and recognized him as his heir, passing by his two sons by Alpaida, Charles and Childebrand. Charles was at this time twenty-five years old and had already distinguished himself in a marked degree for capacity

and valor. This rendered the condition of affairs strangely complex. In the first place, there was a shadow-king, Dagobert III, now fifteen years old. This boy-king had for Mayor of the Palace and confidential adviser a little child of six. Lastly, this little child had a "very prudent" grandmother who, as regent, attempted to rule all. The first act of this grandmother, Plectrude, on being made regent, was to imprison her step-son, Charles, in a castle at Cologne. Upon this a storm burst forth which came near sweeping away the entire Frankish monarchy. The Neustrians arose and, having chosen as their leader one of their own countrymen, Raginfrid by name, declared war upon Plectrude and her grandson, Theudwald, and inflicted upon them a crushing defeat. Dagobert III died shortly afterwards and a priest of Merwing blood was brought forth from his retreat and crowned king with the title of Chilperic II. The civil war dragged on till 715, when the Austrasians set Charles at liberty and rose en masse against Plectrude. They succeeded, after two years of struggle, in overthrowing the Neustrians and their allies at Cambrai and removing Plectrude from all power by shutting her up in a convent. Charles was now firmly established as ruler over all the Franks with the title of Duke of Austrasia.

The one event of world-wide importance in Charles' leadership of the Franks was his victory over the Moslem invaders of Gaul. Here he acted as the champion of Christianity against Mohammedanism. In 718, the Arabs, already masters of nearly all of Spain, poured over the Pyrenees into the Narbonese district and attempted the conquest of the southern part of Gaul. In 721 they made an attack upon Toulouse, but Odo, the ruler of that city, drove them back again into Spain. Eleven years afterwards Abd-el-Rahman, commander of the Kalif's army in Spain, crushed the opposition which Odo was able to offer, sacked Bordeaux, and ravaged Aquitaine far and wide. Odo fled to Charles for aid, who hastily gathered together all his strength and gave battle to the Arab host between Tours and Poitiers. This is known as the battle of Tours, although, as a matter of fact, the struggle took place some distance from that city.

It was here that the Arabian horsemen met the footmen of the West; the Semitic race made trial of strength with the Germanic; the civilization of the East, under the banner of the Crescent, met and tried issues with that of the Cross. And the Cross was victorious; the brave leader of the Moslem host lay dead upon the field, and Charles here won for himself the title of "the Hammer" (Martel). The remainder of his reign was a mere monotony of ceaseless strife with the half-subjugated Saxons to the northeast beyond the Rhine, and the enemies to the south of the Loire. Charles died in 741, dividing his power between his sons, Carloman and Pippin. To Carloman fell the Germanic part, Austrasia, Thuringia, and Swavia. To Pippin fell the Gallic part, Neustria, Burgundy, and Provence. Thus Carloman had the Saxon enemy to contend with, while Pippin must needs guard against the inroads of the Saracen and the ill will of southern Gaul.

Carloman ruled his share wisely and well for six years when, being possessed with a desire for rest and retirement, he gave his temporal power to his brother Pippin and entered a monastery. Pippin, known as "the Short," now became sole ruler of the Franks. Shortly after the retirement of Carloman, Childeric II ascended the throne, thus keeping up the shadowy rule of the Merwing family. Pippin now thought the time ripe for the assumption of the crown, for the name as well as the fame of ruling, and began to look about him for a pretext for setting aside Childeric without losing the good will of the nobility. To accomplish this Pippin sought the aid of the pope and for this a door was open. In 741, Gregory III had written to Charles Martel asking his help against the Lombards, and offering in return title of Patrician of the Romans, and even hinting at a revived Western Empire. However, Charles and Gregory both died within the year and the matter was dropped for a time. Pippin had heard of this from his father and now sent ambassadors to the pope, Zacharias, to reopen negotiations. The new pope had taken up the quarrel with the Lombards where his predecessor had left it and was very much in need of just such aid as Pippin was able to furnish.

He now made answer, to Pippin's inquiry, that "he who has the power ought also to have the name of king." He further said, "If you will smite the Lombard, we will transfer to you the seigniorial rights once belonging to the emperors, now in abeyance." This was just such aid as Pippin desired. He therefore called together an assembly of all the Franks. With their hearty approval he took Childeric II, deposed him, and was declared king in his stead. He was crowned with great pomp and ceremony at the old Roman city of Soissons, in 752. As soon as Pippin was made king, he hastened to redeem his promise to the pope. He crossed the Alps with a large army and fell upon the Lombards, whom he defeated and whose king he shut up in Pavia. Later a peace was ratified in accordance with the terms of which the Lombard king yielded up the Exarchate of Ravenna which he had but recently taken possession of. This Pippin gave to the "pope and the Republic of Rome" (755). *This is the famous "Donation of Pippin" which marked the beginning of the temporal power of the popes.* This is somewhat fully discussed in another chapter.

After this Pippin engaged in a tedious war against the Aquitanians. In 760 he made an expedition against Waifar, Duke of Aquitania, because he had infringed upon the rights and property of the Frankish churches situated in his territory. This trouble lasted for eight years, until the death of Waifar, when the whole territory submitted and measures were taken to solidify and unite the newly acquired territory. This task was scarcely completed before the death of the king. Upon the close of hostilities Pippin immediately undertook the completion of the organization of the church. The internal regulations of the church had been carried on after the death of Boniface, in 754, upon lines laid down by him. In July, 755, an important council was held in Verneuil at which not only nearly all the bishops of Gaul were present but Pippin himself was there, "and took an interested part in all its discussions and decisions." This council attempted the complete organization of the Frankish church. By its provisions a bishop was to be appointed for each city who should be under the metropolitan

(archbishop) of the archiepiscopal see to which his city belonged. Each bishop was to have rule over the clergy, both regular and secular, in his own diocese. A synod was to be held twice a year. The first was to be held in March whenever the king should appoint, and in his presence; the second was to meet in October, either at Soissons or wherever the bishops agreed at the March synod. At this synod all bishops under metropolitans should be present, and all others, whether bishops, abbots, or presbyters, whom the metropolitans summoned. The monks and nuns must observe the monastic rule under the orders of the bishop of the diocese. In case opposition to the authority of the bishop arises the metropolitan is to be notified, and if this fails, recourse may be had to the public synod held in March. In event of further refusal, the offender may be deposed and excommunicated by all the bishops and another put in his place at the synod by the word and will of the king or by the consent of the bishops. There is to be no public baptistry in a diocese save where the bishop appoints, but in case of necessity or illness presbyters whom the bishop has appointed may baptize wherever convenient. Presbyters are to be under the rule of the bishops, and none is to baptize or to celebrate Mass without the order of the bishop of the diocese. All presbyters were to assemble at the council of the bishops. A bishop may depose or excommunicate his presbyter for cause. Being excommunicated, he could not eat nor drink with any Christian, nor accept his gifts, nor give the kiss nor unite in prayer, nor exchange greetings until reconciled with his bishop. If any claims to be unjustly excommunicated he may go to the metropolitan and have a new trial. If still unwilling to submit, he will be forced into exile by the king. Canon XX of Chalcedon is repeated, forbidding him to remove to another city or to serve under a layman except in case of necessity. Wandering bishops, without a fixed diocese, shall not serve in any diocese nor ordain except by the order of the bishop of the diocese. Any offense against this rule is to be punished by the synod. Sunday is to be kept, not after the Jewish fashion of absolute idleness, but so as not to interfere with going to church. But of this

the clergy and not the laity shall be judge. All marriages, both of nobles and low born, shall be performed publicly. Clergy shall not administer estates nor engage in secular affairs except for churches, widows and orphans, by the order of the bishop. In case of the death of a bishop, his bishopric shall not be left vacant more than three months except by great and urgent necessity. Surely at the next synod a bishop shall be ordained. No one shall be tried by the laity except by the express order of his bishop or abbot. All immunities are assured to all churches. Counts and judges at their courts shall try first the cases of orphans, widows and churches, and others afterwards. No one shall attain any office or rank in the church for money; nor shall any bishop or abbot or layman take any fee for administering justice.

The important document quoted above completed the establishment of the diocesan system throughout the Frankish Kingdom. It also established the system of metropolitans or archbishops but it says nothing about the Bishop of Rome and a final appeal lay to the synod or last of all to the king. Thus the work of Pippin was finished. The work which he accomplished in the spread of Christianity and the organization of the church was destined to outlast his attempts at political organization and unity.

## CHAPTER XXIII

### THE ANGLO-SAXONS

I HAVE already had occasion to mention the people who have given a name to this chapter, for to this tribe belonged the great German hero, Hermann, who organized the first successful resistance to Roman aggression and who used his battle-axe with such telling effect at the famous battle of the Teutoberger Wald where the Roman soldiers of Varus were so disastrously defeated. The Saxons were very closely related to the Lombards, whose journey to the valley of the Po has been traced in another chapter, and who were overthrown by the Franks and absorbed by the abject Roman population and their national characteristics lost. From the time of Tacitus, at least, the Saxons occupied the lowlands along the shores of the North Sea, from the mouth of the Ems to that of the Elbe. West of these, reaching as far as the mouth of the Rhine, lay the Frisians, a closely related tribe, while the Angles and Jutes, also kindred tribes, occupied what is now known as the Danish Peninsula. All these peoples were embraced in the later Saxon Confederacy and were known by the general name of Saxons, or "Ax-men." They all belonged to the Low-German branch of the great Germanic family and were very closely related to the Scandinavians and Netherlanders, having with them a common religion, a common speech, and common social and political institutions. It is scarcely to be supposed that at this stage of their history they looked upon themselves as forming one people, but each was destined to share in the conquest of Britain and to contribute a part to the making of the one great English nation.

The lands in which these various Saxon tribes dwelt had the same features. They were largely beneath the sea-level and were, therefore, marshy and waste, with thinly inter-

spersed knolls of gravel and sand. Long shallow rivers dragged themselves along through fen-lands with such a sluggish movement that the eye could scarcely determine the direction of the current. Everywhere were stagnant pools formed by the wind's causing the waves to overleap the banks. Over the whole land hung perpetual mists and fogs which caused the abundant verdure to drip with moisture. The land was covered with immense forests of oak and beech, while the whole narrow, low-lying coast was beaten by a stormy and relentless sea, the shallow waters of which were churned to their entire depths by the winds which swept around Scotland and were deflected by the Norway coast. "Rain, wind and surge, mist, fog and gloomy forest, varies in winter with frost, snow and ice, with threatening deluge of waters from the angry sea; all these were the companions of the Saxons."

The people who inhabited these low and gloomy forest lands largely partook of the nature of their surroundings. They were a half-naked and savage people, restless, harsh, and cruel. The historian Taine thus admirably describes them: "Huge white bodies, cold-blooded, with fierce blue eyes, reddish flaxen hair, ravenous stomachs, filled with milk and cheese, heated by strong drinks; of a cold temperament, slow to love, home-stayers, prone to brutal drunkenness. These are to this day the features which descent and climate preserve in the race, and these are what the Roman historian discovered in their former country." Storm-beaten amid the dangers and hardships of seafaring life, rough and boisterous as their own sea, the Saxons were pre-eminently fitted by nature for endurance and enterprise. They were inured to misfortune and scorers of danger. For such as they the sea had no terrors. "They left the cultivation of the land and the care of the flocks to the women and slaves and gave their undivided attention to war and pillage, which occupations they deemed the only worthy ones for a free-man." They dashed to sea in their two-sailed barks, steered by booty-loving hands against the dwellings of men with whom "God was angry," and, thus divinely directed, landed anywhere, killed everything, and, having sacrificed in honor

of their gods the tithe of their prisoners, and leaving behind them the red light of their burnings, went farther on to begin again. An old Britsh litany written at this time had the following: "Lord deliver us from the fury of the Jutes. Of all the barbarians these are the strongest of body and heart, the most cruelly ferocious." Their life upon the sea made them fearless. They laughed at winds and storms and sang, "The blast of the tempest aids our oars; the bellowing of the thunder hurts us not; the hurricane is our servant, and drives us whither we wish to go."

The social and institutional life of the Saxons in their old home is very imperfectly known. Their country was not contiguous to any part of the Roman empire, and yet it is certain that they had felt, in no small degree, the influence of Roman civilization. Brooches, sword-belts, and shield-bosses have been discovered in Sleswick which are very clearly of Roman make or patterned after Roman models. These cannot be dated later than the end of the third century. The vessels of twisted glass which were made use of at the tables of English and Saxon chieftains were surely the product of Roman glass-works, while Roman coins brought to light in the peat-mosses of Sleswick afford a very conclusive proof of direct intercourse with the empire. Moreover, outside of the influence of Rome, the Saxon tribes were far from being mere savages. They were fierce warriors, indeed, but they were also persistent fishermen and ardent cultivators of the soil. They were as proud of their skill in handling the rude plow and the mattock, or steering the boat with which they hunted the whale and walrus, as they were of the dexterity with which they wielded the sword and the spear. Like all Germans, they were hard drinkers and sat long at the "alefeast" which was the center of their social life. The fervor which they showed in battle also exhibited itself in their drinking-bouts which oftentimes lasted till the break of day. In the strong-beamed hall of their king or alderman they ranged themselves upon the benches about the wall, while the queen or lady with her train of maidens passed round among them with the ale-bowl or mead-bowl from which all were helped with an unsparing hand.

while the gleemen sank the hero-songs of their race. The cups from which they drank were round of bottom and had to be held in the hand until emptied. This fact in itself incited to immoderate drinking as it was deemed discourteous to spill any of the precious liquor and a lack of manhood to be unable to drain the cup at a draught. "Rings, amulets, ear-rings, and neck-pendants proved in their workmanship the deftness of the goldsmith's art. Cloaks were often fastened with golden buckles of curious and exquisite form, set sometimes with rough jewels and inlaid with enamel. The bronze boar-crest on the warrior's helmet, the intricate adornment of the warrior's shield, tell alike the honor in which the smith was held in their tale of industrial art." Their farming implements were very crude and primitive, more like those used by the Celts of the Neolithic Age than those of the Romans, while their pottery was of the coarsest and rudest make possible.

Although Christianity had by this time brought about the conversion of the Roman Empire, it had not as yet penetrated the Saxon home, where paganism still sat enshrined. Of this paganism we know very little, but it was doubtless the same as that of the other branches of the Germanic race. Woden was the common god of the English people, the war-god of all the Germans. His name is said to be derived from the root of a verb meaning to "go" or "wander" and has been supposed by some to denote his all-pervading influence. But this primitive meaning seems to have become merged into that of "energy" and "impetuosity," so that Woden would signify "the wild, ferocious one." This is hardly the light in which he is represented to us by Tacitus who speaks of Woden as the "northern Mercury." Yet Woden and Mercury had many traits in common. They were both the protectors of boundaries and roads and the inventors of letters. Woden was likewise the ancestor of every Saxon hero. He was the arranger of battles and the giver of victory and as such was held in greatest reverence by our ancestors. Other gods of the Saxon people are recalled by the names of the days of the week. Wednesday is Woden's day. Thursday is the day of Thunor, the northern Thor, the god of storm

and rain, of thunder and lightning. He it was who hurled his hammer at those who offended him, which instrument of punishment always returned to his hand. To him were dedicated lightning-struck trees. Friday is Fre'a's day, the god of peace and joy and fruitfulness, of sunshine and spring showers. The boar was sacred to this god and its figure was worn as a charm by warriors on their helmets and, borne aloft by dancing maidens, brought increase to every field and stall they visited. The boar's head at Christmas time is probably a survial of the superstitions connected with this ceremony. Saturday may well be a corruption of "Saturn's day," and so be of Roman origin. Besides these great gods, there were many lesser ones. Eastre, the god of the dawn or of spring, lends his name by a happy circumstance to the Christian festival of the resurrection. According to the venerable Bede, all these gods had temples in which were placed images and altars, and priests were dedicated to their service.

There were also other deities of a somewhat more vague and impersonal nature, but which were more intimately associated with the life of the people. Of these the most prominent was the death-goddess. She it was who wove the web of destiny for every man at his birth and pursued him with "grim and cruel hate." In the memory of northern superstition she has lingered long. The Shield-Maidens were the mighty women who "wrought on the battle-field their toil and hurled the thrilling javelins." Among the mighty giants were Weland, the wondrous craftsman who forged the sword with which Beowulf slew Grendel, and whose name still survives in "Weyland's Smithy" of Berkshire, and his brother Aegel who performed the wondrous feats afterwards related of Tell and other heroes. These, in popular fancy, became the hero-gods of legend. Every nook and cranny were peopled with water-sprites and nixies, from one of whom, Nicor, comes "old Nick" himself. It will be seen that this is but the nature-worship which was common to all the Germans and which lent itself but poorly to the purposes of a priesthood. Every freeman was his own house-priest just as he was his own judge and lawmaker. These notions were not

out of keeping with the materialistic conceptions of the Christianity of the Middle Ages. Even now, in country districts, traces may be found of practices for the origin of which we must go back to the days of Woden and Thunor.

The song of Beowulf, the earliest of English poems, although written in its present form in the days of Bede and Boniface, and having a thin veil of Christianity draped about it, is in reality the hero-legend of our fathers and was composed in the old home-land of Sleswick. In it breathes the secret of the moral temper and the conception of life of our ancestors. Says the historian Green, "Life was built with them not on the hope of a hereafter, but on the proud self-consciousness of noble souls. 'I have this folk ruled this fifty winters,' sings a hero-king, as he sits death-smitten beside the dragon's mound, 'lives there no folk-king of kings about me — not any one of them — dare in the war-strife welcome my onset! Time's change and chances I have abided, held my own fairly, sought not to snare men; oath never swore I falsely against right. So for all this may I glad be at heart now, sick though I sit here, wounded with death-wounds!' In men of such a temper, strong with the strength of manhood and full of the vigor and the love of life, the sense of its shortness and of the mystery of it all woke chords of a pathetic poetry. An old rhyme ran as follows: 'Soon will it be that sickness or sword-blade shear thy strength from thee, or fire ring thee, or the flood whelm thee, or the sword grip thee, or arrow hit thee, or age overtake thee, and thy eye's brightness sink down in darkness.'" Their thought seemed to be that man struggled in vain with the doom that encompassed him and which girded his life with a thousand perils and broke it at so short a span. The sadness, however, with which these Englishmen fronted the mysteries of life and death had nothing in it of that unmanly despair which bids men eat and drink and be merry for to-morrow they die. With them, death left man still master of his fate. The thought of good fame and of manhood was stronger than the thought of doom. Early English poems continually set worth the common ideas that, if life be short, there is all the more cause to work bravely until

it is spent. "Each man of us shall abide the end of his lifework; let him that may work, work his doomed deeds ere death come!"

The energy of these restless peoples drove them to take a part in the general onslaught upon Rome. While Visigoth, Ostrogoth, Vandal, Lombard, and Frank were making their toilsome marches over mountains and streams and through morasses and dreary plains, bent upon the destruction of the empire and the great cities to the south and west, the Saxons drove their war-vessels across the stormy seas intent upon the same mission of bloodshed and war. This was no new occupation for them. Tribe had continually warred with tribe and village with village. The mood of the Saxon was pre-eminently that of the fighting man, venturesome, self-reliant, and proud. He had a dash of hardness and cruelty within him, common to all the Germans, but this was ennobled by the virtues which spring from war, personal courage and loyalty to plighted word. He had a high and stern sense of manhood. Again quoting from Green, "A grim joy in hard fighting was already a characteristic of the race. War was the Englishman's 'shield-play,' and 'sword-game'; the gleeman's verse took fresh fire as he sang of the rush of the host and the crash of its shield-line. Their arms and weapons, helmet and mail-shirt, tall spear and javelin, sword and seax, the short broad dagger that hung at each warrior's girdle, gathered to them much of the legend and the art which gave color and poetry to the life of Englishmen. Each sword had its name like a living thing. And next to their love of war came their love of the sea. Everywhere, throughout Beowulf's song, as everywhere throughout the life that it pictures, we catch the salt whiff of the sea. The Englishman was as proud of his sea-craft as of his war-craft; sword in teeth he plunged into the sea to meet the walrus and sea-lion; he told of his whale-chase amidst the icy waters of the north. Hardly less than his love for the sea was the love that he bore to the ship that traversed it. In the fond playfulness of English verse the ship was the 'wave-floater,' the 'foam-necked,' 'like a bird,' as it skimmed

the wave-crest, ‘like a swan,’ as its curved prow breasted the ‘swan-road’ of the sea.”

Although we have seen the flag of the descendants of these sea-rovers float over every sea and flutter in every breeze that sweeps over the surface of the earth, yet we can not contemplate without astonishment and admiration these hardy old sailors, sweeping every estuary and bay and, without compass, traversing every ocean; swarming on every point and landing on every shore which promised plunder or a temporary rest from their fatigues. There was here indeed an unchaining of the butcherly instincts. Here is seen that obstinate and frenzied bravery of an over-strong temperament intensified by an utter contempt of death and a belief that the pleasures of life with Woden awaited the warrior who fell in the thickest of the fight.

Chance has preserved for us one of the war-keels of these early pirates, embedded and preserved in a peat-bog in Sleswick. It is a flat-bottomed boat, some seventy feet long and eight or nine feet wide, its sides of oak board fastened with bark ropes and iron bolts. It was driven over the waves freighted with its quota of warriors fully armed for the fight, by means of fifty oars. Their arms, axes, swords, lances, and knives were found heaped together in its hold. Such a boat could only creep along from port to port during rough weather. In smooth weather, however, its swiftness fitted it for the piratic raids in which men were engaged. It could easily be beached by reason of its flat bottom upon almost any coast. The seamen were in this manner transformed into a warrior band who were as well skilled in the use of the sword as the oar. “Foes are they,” sang a Roman poet of the time, “fierce beyond other foes and cunning as they are fierce; the sea is their school of war and the storm their friend; they are sea-wolves that prey on the villages of the world!” Here is the theme of an old Saxon love song. The son of an old earl meets the daughter of a neighboring ruler and immediately falls in love with her. He offers himself in marriage seven times in as many successive days, and is each time refused by the maiden on the ground that he

has done nothing to distinguish himself; that her husband must be a hero. In no way discouraged by seven refusals, and fired by an ambition to make himself worthy, he joins one of his father's expeditions in which he plays a valiant part. Immediately on his return, he seeks the object of his affection and renews his offer. "What have you done?" is the query of the maiden. This is the answer: "I have marched with my bloody sword and the raven has followed me; furiously we fought; we slept in the blood of those who kept the gates." The saga ends with a description of the wedding. If you can imagine a lover successfully wooing a gentle maiden with such a love song as the above, then you have a very fair idea of those Saxon ancestors who crossed into Britain in the fifth and sixth centuries. Their political institutions were the same as those of the other Germanic peoples, which we have already described.

If now we glance at the Isle of Britain, to which these sea-robbers are making their way, we will be struck with the similarity of soil and climate to the old homeland of the invaders; a flat coast, beaten by the waters of the same treacherous, angry sea; currentless rivers that ooze their way to the ocean; a damp, cheerless atmosphere, dense with mist and fog, and but seldom pierced by the rays of the sun. Over the whole land is spread herbage and foliage more dense and green than can be found anywhere else in Europe, while the ceaseless drip, drip, drip of the rain at "Dedlock Hall" does but represent in miniature the whole island's humidity. The trees gathered and condensed the vapor; the crops grew rapidly but ripened slowly, for the ground and the atmosphere were alike overloaded with moisture. Caesar accurately described this in 55 b. c. and these same characteristics are noticeable throughout the island today. The downs and the hill-tops alone rose above the perpetual tracts of woods which grew so densely that some districts could scarcely be penetrated. While Roman civilization made a rapid transformation of Britain and changed its outer aspect from that which Claudius saw when he landed, it was still far enough from being completely subdued. "In spite of its roads, its towns, and its mining-

works, it remained, even at the close of the Roman rule, an 'isle of blowing wood-lands,' a wild and half-reclaimed country, the bulk of whose surface was occupied by forest and waste." Four hundred years of Roman occupation had not been sufficient greatly to change this aspect. A glance at the map suggests the idea that Titan hands wrenched Britain from the mainland of Europe and her population passed dry-shod from Belgic Gaul. The importance of this similarity of soil and climate to that of the old Saxon home cannot easily be overestimated. People cannot change their abodes and pass from a cold damp climate to a warm sunny one; from the plain to the mountain; from a continent to an island; without at the same time changing their ideas and habits and ways of thinking; without modifying in the course of a few generations their physical type. This is the explanation of the quick decay of the Vandals in Africa, the Visigoths in Spain, and the Ostrogoths and Lombards in Italy.

Like Europe, Britain in prehistoric times had been occupied by various races of mankind. Of these the oldest have left little or no trace of their occupancy. The Neolithic, or new-stone men, who took the place of the older inhabitants, came from the southeast of Europe and represented a far higher type of development than did the people whom they displaced. They brought with them domesticated animals, the dog, ox, pig, sheep, and goat. They were somewhat crudely acquainted with the arts of spinning and weaving. They used stone weapons of warfare, as did their predecessors, but these they polished into shapely forms and fitted with wooden handles, thus adding to their usefulness. They knew something of agriculture and buried their dead with great care, making a chamber of flat stones in which they placed the body, and erecting over it a pile of stones or earth in an elliptic shape not unlike a pear cut in half lengthwise and placed with its flat surface downwards. These burial places are known as long barrows. We can form some sort of an idea as to the appearance of these men by an examination of the remains found in these barrows. They were short in stature, not averaging more than five

feet, five inches in height, with swarthy complexion and black curly hair. Their skulls were oval, their foreheads low, and their chins small. It is not known how long the Neolithic man remained in undisputed possession of Britain, but their settlements were finally invaded by a set of newcomers who, by reason of their strength, numbers, or skill, were able to drive out the older race and take possession of the districts which pleased them best. The new-comers were Celts, the advance-guard of a group of nations which have played the most important part in the history of the world and are known to ethnologists as the Aryan family.

The Celts were light of limb and tall of stature, having an average height of five feet, eight inches. To the much shorter new-stone man the Celts would appear gigantic. They had high foreheads, prominent cheek-bones, and blue eyes. They buried their dead with reverence and covered the grave with a barrow shaped like a cone.

When the van-guard of the Celts reached Britain, they had fairly completed the conquest of the Neolithic population and compelled them to evacuate the greater part of Gaul and the Spanish Peninsula. During this period the Celts underwent a change in civilization. They adopted weapons of bronze and in this manner wrought a revolution. They not only overthrew their enemies with greater ease, but made vast advancement in agriculture.

After the lapse of some time, a new swarm of Celts made their appearance in Britain and drove the older settlers before them, just as these had displaced the Neolithic men. This produced a general westward movement of the entire population. This second Celtic wave, known as Brithons, settled down in the best portions of the southern part of the island and gave their name to the whole land, while the older Celtic stock, under the name of Gaels, passed into the highlands of Scotland and across the Irish Sea into Ireland. The superiority of this second band of Celtic invaders over the preceding one was beyond a doubt due to their knowledge of the use of iron. We have, in this way, representatives of the Paleolithic, the Neolithic, the Bronze, and the Iron Ages in Britain.

Meanwhile, the pressure of the Germans from across the Rhine caused the Celts of Gaul to continue their westerly movement. The Belgae, a tribe who dwelt between the Seine and the Scheldt, began to send colonies across the Channel and to dispossess the Britons. This was the condition of the population of the island when the Romans first appeared.

It is altogether probable that the restlessness of the war-like Belgae was connected with the conquests that were then being made by the Romans in southern Gaul. In the year 55 b. c., Julius Caesar, the greatest of all the Romans and perhaps the greatest man in history, having completed the conquest of Gaul, stood a victor on the southern shore of the Straits of Dover and gazed across at the white cliffs of Albion. Caesar was ambitious, not only for himself, but for Rome, and was consequently desirous of adding Britain to the Roman dominion. Many reasons existed for this conquest. Its inhabitants were bound to those of Gaul by common blood and religion. It would, in Caesar's opinion, be dangerous to the Roman dominion in Gaul to have a sympathetic, powerful, and independent state so near her own borders, ready to give aid to their kinsmen across the British Channel should opportunity arise. Caesar, therefore, determined to subdue these peoples. He sailed from Portus Itius with ten thousand foot-soldiers and made his way to where the white cliffs of Dover could be seen upon the horizon. It was with considerable difficulty that a landing was effected, owing to the determined opposition of the Britons. A portion of the forces pushed to the shore and forced the enemy to retreat. Here they formed camp and drew their vessels high up on the shore; but the ships carrying Caesar's cavalry were beaten back by a severe storm and could not succeed in making a landing. The enemy rallied and attempted to carry Caesar's camp by storm, but were easily beaten back and, being discouraged, sued for peace. Peace was welcome to Caesar, as he had already perceived that the conquest of the island would be impossible with so small a body of troops. He accepted the terms offered and forthwith returned to Gaul.

The following year, he renewed his effort at conquest by

landing on the shores of Britain an army of 21,000 foot-soldiers and 2000 cavalry. With this army, he was able to overthrow any force the Britons might bring against him, but he really accomplished little or nothing. Again he made peace with the enemy, having ordered hostages to be delivered and having fixed the amount of tribute which was to be paid by Britannia to the Roman people, and hastened away to Gaul, where rebellion had already broken out.

After this invasion, Britain was left in peace by the Romans for nearly one hundred years, when Tiberius Claudius decided upon the subjugation of Britain and for the purpose sent four legions of soldiers to that island under the command of Aulus Plautius, a senator of high rank and a possible kinsman of Claudius by marriage. This total expedition numbered some 50,000 men, mostly veterans who had seen service in the East or in Africa and Spain. Among the officers were the famous Vespasian and his son Titus. Plautius landed his army without difficulty and shortly afterwards defeated the islanders in a battle in which Togodumnus, one of the native kings, was killed and his brother put to flight. The victory resulted in the conquest of the south-eastern portion of the island, from the boundaries of South Wales to the vicinity of Lincoln. Claudius himself came from Rome and was present with the army at the capture of the royal city of Camulodunum in 43 A. D. After a six months' absence, he returned to Rome and was greeted by the senate with the title, Britannicus, in honor of his victory, and the same title was bestowed upon his six-year-old son. Aulus Plautius returned to Rome in the year 47 to receive the honor of an ovation and to find his wife converted to Christianity. He left the command in Britain to Ostorius Scapula. Thus was begun the real conquest of Britain by the Romans. Ostorius was followed by Suetonius and Agricola in turn, the latter being the father-in-law of the historian Tacitus. Agricola was recalled, in 81, and subsequent governors left no record of their achievements. Roman soldiers remained in the island for three hundred years longer and the buildings which they constructed, the altars which they inscribed, the roads which they made, tell

us something of the life which they led, but history is almost wholly silent.

There can be no doubt that civilization in Britain was highly developed during the Roman period. The Latin language came into use to a very large extent, as thousands of inscriptions testify. The same gods were worshipped here that were worshipped at Rome. Temples and altars were dedicated to Jupiter and other Roman deities. It is probable that Christianity was introduced quite early into Britain, but there are no authentic records, and its influence cannot have been very great as there has been discovered but one Christian emblem or inscription among the Roman remains.

As time passed, the prosperity and good order of the empire fell away. Britain, no doubt, felt and participated in this general decay. Wealth and population declined from year to year. Taxes grew heavier, as the expenses of the imperial administration increased, while the growth of poverty made it more and more difficult to meet the fiscal demands. The frontiers were being broken over by the barbarian races and the protection of the inhabitants inadequate, while the Roman armies were constantly engaged in conflicts with various tribes which were trying to make their way into the empire. The principal enemies of Britain from the outside were Franks and Saxons who ravaged the southeast coast from the sea, the Scots from the north of Ireland who made frequent descents upon the northwest coast, and the Caledonians who still invaded the province from the north, notwithstanding the great wall of Hadrian. To shut out the Franks and Saxons, the Romans built a line of forts along the southeastern coast and kept a fleet in the Channel. The command of these forts and the fleet was intrusted to an officer known as the "Count of the Saxon Shore in Britain" and this officer was continually employed in beating off invaders.

Still, Britain had only been partially conquered by the Romans and had, through their entire domination, as we have seen, preserved her three peoples distinct. North of the Roman wall, where the Roman legions rarely penetrated,

were the Caledonians, still fierce and barbarous; to the south and east, lay the Loegrians (Britons), who had submitted to Roman civilization and had received Christianity; westward beyond the Severn, were the Cambrians or Welsh, a people unconquerable in their mountain fastnesses. To this latter people belonged the famous Arthur of Celtic legend who slew four hundred of the enemy (our people) in a single day; a poet's fancy, nothing more, and if it were true it would only serve to illustrate the staying qualities of our ancestors, who, having once set foot upon a shore, shrank not from the price, nor hesitated, nor halted, nor turned back, till they made it their own.

When the Roman legions which guarded the frontiers of Britain and the Saxon coast were called home to defend the Eternal City in her dying struggle with the Vandal, Ostrogoth, and Hun, the Caledonian and Cambrian rushed down from their wild and rocky homes and hastened to lay waste the fertile valleys which the Romanized Celt was utterly unable to protect. Against these barbarians from the north and west, the civilized Loegrian finally summoned, if we may believe the story, the still more barbarous and cruel Jutes from beyond the Channel, with the promise of the Isle of Thanet off the coast of Kent as pay for their services. They came, in 449, under their chiefs, Hengest and Horsa, and landed upon the Isle of Thanet, "the gift-land," at a spot now known as Ebbsfleet, and with this landing English history begins. "No spot can be so sacred to Englishmen as the spot which first felt the tread of English feet. There is little to catch the eye in Ebbsfleet itself, a mere lift of ground with a few gray cottages dotted over it, cut off now-a-days from the sea by a reclaimed meadow and a sea-wall." But taken as a whole the scene has a wild beauty of its own. To the right the white curve of Ramsgate cliffs looks down on the crescent of Pegwell Bay; far away to the left across grey marsh-levels where smoke-wreaths mark the site of Richborough and Sandwich, the coast-line trends dimly toward Deal. Everything in the character of the spot confirm the national tradition which fixed here the landing place of our fathers. "The task for which this warrior band has been

hired was quickly done, the Picts being thoroughly defeated and scattered to the winds in a battle fought on the eastern coast of Britain. And now there awaited for Britain the same fate that had overtaken Rome and Persia and Syria, and which awaits, indeed, every nation whose sword arm has become nerveless and which calls on foreigners to fight its battles. This "nest of pirates" in Thanet was quickly reinforced by a great army of their friends who joined them from their old home. Thus reinforced and finding their quarters too narrow, they turned their arms against their late allies and drove them in terror from their homes. Northern Kent was quickly conquered and taken possession of by the families and relatives of the invaders which were brought over from Thanet or their old home in Jutland. They established their capital at Canterbury in 455. Horsa having fallen in battle, Hengest was recognized as king and pushed his conquests towards the south where the Britons still bravely held their ground. By 475, he had overcome all opposition and subdued under its sway the territory of the Ancient *Cantii*, that peninsula lying between the Channel and the Thames.

And now commenced on the part of the Saxons a struggle for the possession of the whole island. In 477, Saxon invaders were seen pushing slowly along the strip of land which lay to the west of Kent between the great forest Andraeds-weald and the sea. This southern coast was guarded by a fortress which occupied the spot now called Pevensey, then known by the name of Anderida. This fort was beset by a band of Saxons under their leader, Aelle, and taken by storm. The old chronicle reads as follows: "Aelle and Cissa beset Anderida and slew all that were therein, nor was there afterwards one Briton left." The destruction of this fort led quickly to the conquest of the surrounding territory, and the establishment of the little kingdom of Sussex with the royal residence at Chichester, in 491. But this little Saxon kingdom occupied only a small portion of the southern part of Britain. The real conquest of this territory remained to be accomplished by a fresh band of Saxons under the leadership of the famous Cerdic and Cymric. They landed upon

the shores of Southampton Water in 495, and pushed across the Gwent to Winchester. By a decisive victory at Charford, the hot contest for the possession of this territory came to an end, in 519. During this quarter of a century of struggle Cymric died and Cerdic was aised to the dignity of a king. The conquest of the Gwent having been completed, Cerdic established his capital at Winchester which was thus destined to become famous in the annals of English history. Only a year after the battle of Charford, the Britons rallied under a new leader, the famous Arthur, and drove the invaders out of Dorsetshire woodlands after having overthrown them at Badbury. After a long hard struggle for supremacy west of the Severn, which seemed to have had but a sorry outcome, the Saxons turned eastward from Colchester, and founded another kingdom, Sussex, with the capital at London on the Thames, thus making in all four Saxon kingdoms.

But the people who gave the name to the whole race of conquerors had not yet arrived. By the middle of the sixth century only the outskirts of Britain had been won. "From London to St. David's Head, from the Andredswæld to the Firth of Forth the country still remained unconquered; and there was little in the years which followed Arthur's triumph to herald that onset of the invaders which was soon to make Britain England. Till now its assailants had been drawn from two only of the three tribes whom we saw dwelling by the northern sea, from the Saxons and the Jutes. But the main work of conquest was to be done by the third, by the tribe which bore that name of Engle or Englishmen which was to absorb that of Saxon and Jute and to stamp itself on the people which sprang from the union of the conquerors as on the land that they won." In 547, the Angles made their appearance. They probably first entered by the estuary which is known as the Humber and spread northward. Under their king, Aella, they conquered and took possession of York and the region which is called Northumberland, reaching as far northward as the Firth of Forth and embracing the old Roman provinces of Bernicia and Deira. Still others passed south of the Humber and followed the line of the Trent westward to its headwaters. They established

their capital at Lincoln, 584. They later became known as Mercians, or "Men of the March." Still others pushed southward and established two communities of their people known as the North-Folk and the South-Folk. A little later these communities united into the kingdom of *East Anglia* with its capital at Norwich (571).

After the West Saxons were defeated at Badbury, in 521, they remained in something like peace for a period of more than forty years, when they were again aroused into activity by the movement of the Angles in the north and west. Under their king, Ceawlin, they overthrew the Meanwara and added their territory to their own. They then appeared in the valley of the Severn and gradually drove the Britons out of the surrounding country. In 577, they won the decisive battle of Deorham, thus completing the conquest of the Severn valley, and captured the old Roman cities of Bath and Gloucester, leaving them heaps of blackened ruins. They then took possession of the conquered territory and extended their settlements over Gloucestershire and Worcestershire, making this whole territory permanently Saxon. This new conquest cut off the Britons of the southwest from their kinsmen in the north and rendered their overthrow certain.

While the west Saxons were thus pushing their conquests to the west and south, the Angles of Northumberland were not idle. An army of Scots, Piets and Britons, under the leadership of the Scotch king Idam, now attempted the overthrow of the Bernicians, marching into that territory and laying waste the borderlands. The Angles of Bernicia and Deira hastened to meet the confederated army of the Scotch king under their leader, Ethelfrid. The two forces joined battle at Dawstone near Carlisle where the Scots were defeated with great slaughter and were forced to give up all further attempts upon the lands of the Bernicians. In 613, ten years after the battle of Dawstone, Ethelfrid won a second victory over the western Britons under the walls of Chester. The city was taken by the victorious Angles, sacked, and left in ruins. This victory gave to the Angles of Northumberland the possession of all lands between Leeds and the Irish Sea, and in addition separated the Britons of

Strathclyde from the Cambrians, pushing in between them a wedge of Angles. With the battles of Deorham and Chester the era of conquest and settlement of Britain ends. The fertile lands of the old Roman provinces were now in the possession of the Germanic invaders. By the close of the sixth century the Teutons had thoroughly established themselves in Britain.

These seven little barbarian kingdoms now occupied the soil which the Romans had held for nearly four hundred years, and by a very slow process were finally consolidated into one kingdom. A careful study of this conquest will show that it differed radically from those made beyond the Danube and the Rhine by other Germanic peoples. Caledonia was not conquered by the Saxon invaders, while to the west the Cambrians of Strathclyde and of West and South Wales retained their independence and carried on a ceaseless warfare. The Saxons thus kept their wonted surroundings. They had, as of yore, sturdy enemies to fight and so were compelled to keep up their martial training. In this they differed from the other conquerors whose history has been traced. With each of these the struggle was a brief one, practically settled by a single battle, and a people used to a life of war and exposure had peace and unwonted luxury suddenly thrust upon them. But in another respect the contrast is still more striking. The Visigoth, Vandal, Ostrogoth, Lombard and Frank, each and all settled to a life of peace among a conquered and subject population vastly outnumbering and, in the arts of civilization, infinitely superior to themselves. In this way they quickly lost not only their own barbarism but, very largely, their language, institutions, and laws, while those of the conquered people they absorbed too rapidly for a healthful assimilation. The Saxons, on the other hand, swept the ground clean either by totally destroying or driving out into the mountains to the west and north the vanquished Celts. They thus brought their families into an uninhabited land and so continued in purity their old-time manner of life. In this way, of all the Germans who passed the Roman frontier, the Saxons alone kept their wonted surroundings and suffered none of the enervating effects of

change of climate and of environment. Their development was much slower for this very reason, but it was along the line of their national institutions, and, if slow, it was wholesome and continuous. As this story progresses it will become apparent that all the best things in modern civilization we owe to this isolation and consequent pure and untrammelled development of Germanic life.

None of the Germans who invaded Britain had been converted to Christianity prior to their migration and settlement, while the struggle with the Celts was so long and bitter and the hatred engendered so intense, that no effort had been put forth to Christianize them by the people whom they had despoiled of their homes and driven with slaughter and cruelty to the mountains in the west. In fact, the Celts took a sort of grim pleasure in the contemplation of their lost condition and their consequent punishment at the hands of an offended and angry God. One hundred and fifty years had gone by since the landing of Hengest and Horsa upon the Isle of Thanet, yet the descendants of the men who so eagerly followed them in their despoiling of the Celt, still worshipped Woden and peopled every nook and valley with nixies; still looked for the true warrior's reward in a heaven where strife and drinking were to be without end.

By reason of the separate and independent settlement of the various tribes of Angles and Saxons, and the lack of any unity in their struggle for the possession of the island, the tribes which settled in the south and east were quickly cut off from the extension of their boundaries, by reason of other tribes pushing into their rear. Thus it was that Kent found it impossible to expand by conquest to the west and south because the West Saxons and South Saxons had pushed in between her and the Britons. Norfolk and Suffolk suffered in like manner. The Northumbrians were not so hemmed in but pushed their conquest to the north and west; the Mercians of Mid-Britain continued the struggle for supremacy against the Cambrians of North Wales; the West Saxons conquered the valley of the Severn and, by the battle of Deorham, nearly doubled their territory to the north and west. Not long after this battle which gave the Severn and

the territory east of it to the West Saxons, Ceawlin and his victorious followers suffered a disastrous defeat near Chester and their career of conquest came to an end. The federation of the southern and eastern tribes now broke up and even the separate families of the West Saxons began to quarrel among themselves. In the meantime Ethelbert became king of Kent. He was an ambitious and powerful man and, when he perceived the impossibility of extending his rule against the Britons, decided to make himself the overlord of all the minor tribes which had heretofore recognized the headship of Ceawlin. The break-up of Wessex made this possible. We know little of the causes which led to this new movement or the process by which Ethelbert obtained supremacy; but we do know that before his death his overlordship was recognized in Norfolk, Suffolk, Sussex, and by the warring tribes of the West Saxons. About the time that Ethelbert had reached the height of his power he was converted to Christianity in much the same way as many barbarian kings had been before him. In 597, he was married to a Christian princess, Bertha, the granddaughter of Clo-tair the Great, king of the Franks. The men of the Frankish royal house were as a class but little influenced by Christianity, their barbarian instincts being stronger than the Christian veneering which they had received; but the women frequently furnished examples of sweet and noble piety and honored the name of Christ by living blameless and pure lives and leaving behind them the memory of good deeds. Such a woman was Bertha who now went to take up her residence in the Kentish home of her barbarian husband. Gregory the Great was at this time pope of Rome. He had long been fired with an ambition for the conversion of the heathen kingdoms of Britain. The story of his meeting with the Angle captives in the slave market of Rome is a familiar one. Their white bodies and fair faces and golden hair attracted his attention. He asked the trader, "From what country do these slaves come?" The slave dealer answered, "They are Angles." Gregory responded, "Not Angles but Angels, with faces so angel-like! From what country come they?" "They come," said the dealer, "from Deira.' "De ira!"

Gregory replied, "plucked from God's ire and called to Christ's mercy! And what is the name of their king?" "Aella," was the reply. "Alleluia shall be sung in Aella's land," said the good deacon as he passed on his way. This story was related of Gregory while he was yet a deacon. Since then circumstances had conspired to raise him to the papacy and he now determined to carry out his dream of winning Britain to the faith. When Bertha went to Kent she took with her a Christian bishop and a ruined Christian church hard by the royal city of Canterbury was repaired and given over to them for their worship. The king allowed her freedom to worship as she chose although he himself remained for a time true to the gods of his ancestors. Gregory now sent Augustine at the head of a band of monks to preach the gospel to the English people. This band of missionaries landed in 597 in the Isle of Thanet, "at the very spot where Hengest and Horsa had landed more than a century before; and Ethelbert received them sitting in the open air on the chalk-down above minster where the eye now-a-days catches miles away over the marshes the dim tower of Canterbury. The king listened patiently to the long sermon of Augustine as the interpreters the abbot had brought with him from Gaul rendered it in English tongue. 'Your words are fair,' Ethelbert replied at last with English good sense, 'but they are new and of doubtful meaning.' For himself, he said, he refused to forsake the gods of his fathers, but with the usual religious tolerance of the German race he promised shelter and protection to the strangers." It was in this manner that the spot which had witnessed the landing of Hengest one hundred and fifty-eight years before now became still better known by the landing of Augustine. He brought back with him not only Christianity but the civilization, art, and letters which had fled before the sword of the English conquerors and which had remained in cowardly retreat all these years. During the course of a year Ethelbert yielded to the effort of Augustine and his missionaries. The Kentish men thought that what was good enough for their king was good enough for them and crowded to Christian baptism. In this manner all of Kent was Christianized and be-

came a center for the dispensation of the new religion. In 601, Gregory sent to Augustine the archiepiscopal *pallium* with a complete plan for the organization of the whole island. The Bishop of Rome seemed to be ignorant of the various heathen kingdoms in Britain, but deemed them all Angles under one king. The entire island was by him divided into two nearly equal parts or metropolitan sees, each having twelve bishops. The archbishop of the northern district was to be established at York, while the primate of the southern was to be at London. But London was not yet Christianized and Augustine chose Canterbury instead for his residence, as it was under the protection of Ethelbert. Knowing the condition in the island much better than the pope, he left the organization of the northern province and the appointment of the twenty-four bishops to the future, as neither East Saxons, South Saxons nor West Saxons were ready as yet to receive Christian teachers. But Augustine was not contented with the conversion and baptism of the king and his people. He brought with him into the island a knowledge of the ways and arts of the civilized world, and he immediately proceeded to teach these to his new converts. It was through his influence that the customary laws of the people of Kent were reduced to writing and drawn up in the form of a code. This is "the first formal record of the laws of an English people," preceding by more than ninety years the like record which Ine made of the laws of the West Saxons. It is from this code that we obtain almost all of our knowledge of the Anglo-Saxon institutions as they existed at the close of the period of conquest and settlement. They remind us of the descriptions given by Tacitus of the Germans who lived on the borders of the empire in the first century of the Christian Era, and they show that the Germans of Britain had not yet advanced very far beyond the condition of those who were first known to the Romans. The only penalties provided by the laws of Ethelbert were fines, or indemnities, covering almost every conceivable injury to life or limb or property, and varying from the ordinary indemnities prescribed for the wrongs of a freeman to the ninefold penalty prescribed for injury to the king or his

property; the elevenfold penalty prescribed for injury to a bishop, and the twelvefold penalty prescribed in the case of him who destroyed the "goods of God." This plainly reveals the influence of the priest, and the high estate which had already been won by the church.

In 604, Ethelbert put forth a vigorous effort to convert to his own faith the sub-kingdoms which were subject to his rule. Mellitus, one of the missionaries that accompanied Augustine, was sent to preach to the East Saxons. He was very successful in this mission and within the year Sebert, the king, and all his people were converted and brought into the fold. Thus it was that Essex like Kent became Christian. This conversion, however, was shallow in its nature, like that of all the Germanic barbarians, and, in 616, the East Saxons lapsed again into heathenism, being led astray by their new king, Redwald. It was not until 653 that they were permanently converted to Christianity, having received the faith anew through the preaching of the Celtic missionary, Cedd, who was sent among them by Oswy, the king of Deira.

East Anglia was under the overlordship of Ethelbert and missionaries undertook the conversion of this kingdom in accordance with the plan of that king, during the same year that Mellitus succeeded in converting the East Saxons. Redwald, the king of East Anglia, decided to add Christ to the number of his gods, and his people joined him in this mixed Christian idea. He set up in a church an altar to Christ and another to Woden. In 616, Redwald obtained the overlordship which Ethelbert had exercised up to the time of his death. He immediately rejected Christianity as he was dissatisfied with the aid he had received from that source, and his people went with him. The East Anglians thus remained heathen until they were converted by the efforts of a Burgundian priest named Felix. This priest arrived in 627 and succeeded within the year in bringing the East Anglians into the fold of the church. He was made bishop of this province and had his seat at Dunwich, a village which was afterwards overwhelmed by the sea and the site of which is lost.

The rival royal houses of Bernicia and Deira engaged in a long struggle for supremacy over all the territory north of the Humber. In this the Bernician Ethelric first succeeded. He not only united these two kingdoms into the new one of Northumbria, but succeeded in passing his power over to his able and valiant son, Ethelfrid, who succeeded to the joint rule in 593. We have seen how he overthrew the combined forces of the Scots, Picts, and Britons at Dawsome, in 593, and forever broke the power of the Britons under the walls of Chester ten years later. He was himself overthrown in the battle of Retford in Nottinghamshire, 617, by the East Anglian Confederation under the leadership of Redwald. This defeat did not break up the union of Bernicia and Deira, as might be supposed, but instead passed the joint rule to Edwin, an exiled prince of Deira, and descendant of Aella. Ethelfrid had recognized the dangerous rivalry of this prince and pursued him with unusual harshness. It was his demand from Redwald of this distinguished exile that had brought on the war that resulted in Ethelfrid's death. Edwin not only made good his authority in Northumbria, but extended his rule by the conquest of the Isle of Man and Anglesey. He also made himself overlord of East Anglia and all the southern kingdoms except Kent. He next looked about him for a worthy consort and found her in Ethelburga, the daughter of Bertha and Ethelbert of Kent. This beautiful woman had the same task to perform which had been the lot of her Christian mother for her husband was still a heathen and held out strongly for the old faith. He finally decided, however, at the instigation of his wife, to refer the matter to his witan, and when this body of wise men was assembled, Paulinus, his wife's chaplain, made a strong plea for Christianity which seems to have melted the hearts of the grim old warriors. When he had ended, an aged ealdorman arose and made the following speech, which may well stand as a model of beauty and simplicity: "So seems the life of man, O king, as a sparrow's flight through the hall when one is sitting at meat in winter-tide, with the warm fire lighted on the hearth, but the icy rain-storm without. The sparrow flies in at one door, and tar-

ries for a moment in the light and heat of the hearth-fire, and then, flying forth from the other, vanishes into the darkness whence it came. So tarries for a moment the life of man in our sight; but what is before it, what after it, we know not. If this new teaching tell us aught certainly of these, let us follow it." This speech, together with that of the king's priest who denounced the gods whom he had served and asked permission himself to set fire to the pagan temple at Godmundham, decided the king. He asked for baptism and was admitted into the Christian Church on Easter Day, April 12, 627. The conversion of the people went on rapidly. York was made an archiepiscopal see and Paulinus was established as its first archbishop. The chronicle records in glowing terms the peace and security which reigned throughout the whole territory during Edwin's reign and states that "A woman with her child could journey from the Humber to the Firth of Forth without being molested."

But paganism was not to be destroyed without a struggle. The spirit of the old Saxon was too conservative for that. Penda, the powerful king of the Mercians or Englishmen of Mid-Britain, took up the cause of the abandoned gods and, in the battle of Hatfield, some twenty miles to the south of York, overthrew the Northumbrian forces and slew Edwin, their king, in 633. When Edwin fell, Paulinus fled to Kent, taking with him Ethelburga and her two young children, and with this flight the effort of the church to Christianize the North for a time came to an end. Revived paganism flourished anew. Penda did not attempt, after his victory, to add Northumbria to his own kingdom but merely revived the old-time division between Bernicia and Deira. Bernicia seized upon this opportunity to recall the line of Ethelfrid, whose children had been in banishment on the Isle of Iona during the reign of Edwin. The second of his sons, Oswald, was now made king and immediately engaged in a struggle to reestablish the power of Northumbria. He first engaged in battle with Cadwallon, a Celtic king who had united his forces with Penda in the overthrow of Edwin, and had since remained in camp in the north country. Cadwallon was defeated and slain in battle on "Heaven's field," the name aft-

erwards given to the place, because of the fact that the Bernicians had promised Oswald to accept Christianity in case they won the battle. Deira was now again united to Bernicia and the kingdom of Northumbria was restored to full power. However, the Christianity which the Bernicians received was not that of Paulinus and the Church of Rome, for no sooner had Oswald succeeded in reestablishing the kingdom of Northumbria than Irish monks from Hii (Iona) came full of zeal for the conversion of his realm. In 635 Aidan fixed his bishop's stool in the Isle of Lindisfarne, on the coast of Northumbria, where there quickly grew up a famous monastery. Through the efforts of these Irish missionaries Northumbria became permanently Christian.

In the very year in which the Celtic Aiden established his see in the Isle of Lindisfarne the conversion of the West Saxons was brought about. This was accomplished by the preaching of a Lombard priest, Birinus by name, who had found his way into Wessex from northern Italy. The task of converting the West Saxons seemed to be an easy one, perhaps because they were under the influence of Christian Kent, and here there took place no lapse into paganism as was the case in Essex, East Anglia, and Northumbria.

When Penda overthrew the Northumbrian king at Hatfield, it looked for a moment as if Christianity in the north was doomed. This sturdy old barbarian continued to harass and ravage East Anglia and Deira during the time that Oswald was reestablishing the kingdom of Bernicia. His influence caused the newly converted king of Wessex to eschew Christianity and to join his forces with the Mercians. Oswald remained the champion of the Cross, and his short reign was one continuous battle. His doom was finally the same as that of Edwin, for he was overthrown and slain in battle with Penda at Maserfield in 642. Heathenism again triumphed, but Oswy, the younger brother of Oswald, came from his retirement at Iona and took up the task in the carrying on of which his brother had lost his life. He proved himself a very able prince and, while he struggled manfully to save his kingdom, he contended with no less vigor for the Christian cause which he had espoused. The struggle went

on with doubtful issues until 655, when it closed in one last and bloody battle at Winwaed, hard by Leeds. Here Penda, now eighty years old, led on the sturdy forces of paganism. Oswy and his Northumbrian Christians were driven to the last extremity and were forced to fight for their lives. Victory at last declared in their favor; Penda himself fell on the field, while the river over which the Mercians fled was swollen with a great flood of rain and swept away a large portion of those that escaped the sword. Here the cause of the older gods was lost forever. The terrible struggle was followed by a long and profound peace. Before the death of Penda, Christianity had made inroads even into Mercia itself. East Anglia had refused to become paganized, even though conquered by the warriors which followed the lead of Mercia's king. Three years before the battle of Winwaed Penda's son, Peada, married the daughter of Oswy and was thereupon baptized to the Christian faith, his father offering no opposition, that sturdy old chief declaring that he only "hated and scorned those whom he saw not doing the works of the faith they had received." Thus it was that the last stronghold of paganism was carried and all of Mercia accepted the faith which had been preached by the Irish missionaries.

While Christianity had been slowly making its way through the central and northern kingdoms of Britain, Sussex, hemmed in and isolated by her forests and fens, remained stubbornly pagan. The people of this district were at last converted through the ministration of Wilfrid, who had been driven from his see in Northumbria three years before by a civil dissension. He had made a journey to Rome and remained there two years. From this city he set out again for Britain with the purpose of preaching the gospel to the South Saxons. The king of this country, Ethelwalch, had some time before been converted to the new faith while residing in the province of Mercia. He, therefore, received Wilfrid with great satisfaction and aided him in his work in every way that he could. The people, who had hitherto resisted all efforts of missionaries to convert them, now responded joyfully to the ministrations of Wilfrid. The his-

torian Bede says that Wilfrid, “ by preaching to them, not only delivered them from the misery of perpetual damnation, but also from an inexpressible calamity of temporal death, for no rain had fallen in that province in three years before his arrival, whereupon a dreadful famine ensued, which cruelly destroyed the people. In short, it is reported that very often forty or fifty men, being spent with want, would go together to some precipice out to the sea-shore, and there, hand in hand, perish by the fall or be swallowed up by the waves. But on the very day on which the nation received the baptism of faith, there fell a soft but plentiful rain; the earth revived again, the verdure being restored to the fields, the season was pleasant and fruitful. Thus the former superstition being rejected and idolatry exploded, the hearts and flesh of all rejoiced in the living God, and became convinced that He who is the true God had, through his heavenly grace, enriched them with wealth both temporal and spiritual.” *Thus in 681, more than two hundred years after the settlement of these barbarian tribes in Britain, was the last of them converted to Christianity.*

It has already been noticed that the conversion of the Germanic tribes in Britain was not brought about by missionaries from Rome. Augustine and his band of monks did not succeed in permanently converting any of the kingdoms save Kent. The Christian movement which was undertaken in the north by the conversion of Edwin came to nothing, and the great plan which Gregory had submitted for the ecclesiastical government of the island was far from being carried out. It will be remembered that, before the landing of the English in Britain, the Christian Church had stretched in an unbroken line across western Europe to the farthest coasts of Ireland. The Germanic conquests of Britain had thrust a wedge of paganism into the very heart of this great communion and split it in two parts. To the south lay Italy, Spain, and Gaul, whose churches acknowledged the supremacy of the see of Rome. Upon the other side lay the church of Ireland practically cut off from all communication with the rest of Christendom. In fact, the history of Ireland had been somewhat peculiar, as it had never been touched

by Roman conquest. While Britain had been conquered and to a certain extent civilized by Rome, Ireland remained outside of the pale, entirely free from Roman influence. Her government had remained tribal and the Christian Church partook of the main features of her political government. In the centralization of Christianity and the growth of the power of the see of Rome, Ireland had been left out. Here Christianity had been received with enthusiasm as the result of the missionary zeal of Patrick; monasteries were established, and considerable attention given to the spread of knowledge of the Bible and letters. From here missionaries went out in all directions. The famous Irish missionary, Columban, founded monasteries in Burgundy and the Apennines. A mission station established by an Irish refugee upon "a low island of barren gneiss-rock off the west coast of Scotland" became the famous Iona or Hii, so justly celebrated in the history of the north of England and of Scotland. It was here that Oswald found a refuge. When he became king of Northumbria, he summoned missionaries from among its monks to aid in the conversion of his people. It was from here that Aiden went to found his famous monastery at Lindisfarne. From this new center preachers poured forth over the whole of heathen Britain. As a result of this movement, Northumbria and Mercia were converted to Irish Christianity which had thus far never recognized the authority of the pope. The East Anglians had been won over by Felix, a Burgundian priest, while the West Saxons had been baptized by the Lombard Birinus. Thus, there was no uniform rule of faith or harmony of practice; there was no commonly accepted authority before which rival bishops might bring their quarrels for adjustment or the unworthy might be tried and punished. There were many ambitious bishops desirous of extending their own authority over neighboring sees and in this way were oftentimes aided by rival kings who cared not so much for unity and peace within the church as they did for political aggrandizement. "Churchmen were not all saints; and too often the bishops shared fully in the ambitious rivalries of their masters, and lent their influence to conquest and land spoiling, in order

to enlarge their authority, or curtail that of some troublesome neighbor." Of course through it all was some community of life, some feeling of common sympathy, and some sense of common interest, but this idea of unity was at best but vaguely apprehended. There was here a great work to be done, "to take advantage of the natural desire of Christian men for unity, to bring all the churches of Teutonic Britain into one organic system, united under one national primate." This great work was undertaken and accomplished by Wilfrid and Theodore.

Wilfrid was born in the year 634. When fourteen years of age he attracted the attention of Anfled, the wife of Óswy, who sent him to be educated to Lindisfarne. During his years of study at Lindisfarne, Wilfrid's mind had become fired with the desire of visiting the continent and becoming acquainted with the great Christian world which lay beyond the boundaries and the knowledge of his own people. The queen decided to humor this fancy on his part and sent him to Rome that he might pursue his studies and ripen his faculties by travel. He went in the company of Benedict Biscop, a name well known throughout Northumbria. After an absence of four years, he returned and was installed as abbot of Ripon. During his travels and study abroad, the young monk had had his eyes opened and had caught the spirit of the mighty traditions of Rome and had bowed to her authority. He was thoroughly convinced that the practices of the Celtic church were schismatic and he, therefore, demanded that the church of Northumbria should put itself in harmony with Rome. Some of the disciples of Paulinus were still alive and aided the young monk in this effort. To settle the dispute which arose, a synod was summoned at Whitby in 664. Here Colman, the bishop of York, argued in behalf of the practices of his own (the Celtic) church, while Wilfrid ably championed the cause of Rome. King Óswy became at last impatient and decided to take a part in the discussion. Turning to Colman, he asked: "Is it true that the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven were given to Peter by our Lord? Has any such power been given to Columban, the founder of the Scottish church?" Colman

answered: "None." "Then," said the king, "if Peter be the door-keeper, he is the man for me." The logic of the king was beyond dispute. Colman and his monks withdrew from the synod, and once more the Northumbrians began to follow the customs which they had learned from Paulinus. This was the first great step toward unity.

In 668, only four years after the synod of Whitby, Pope Vitalian appointed a Greek monk, Theodore of Tarsus, to the vacant see of Canterbury. He arrived in Kent in the following year with the specific determination of organizing the English church in such a manner as to bring it into direct relations with the see of Rome. When Augustine arrived in Britain, seventy-two years before, the heathen English were divided into three well-marked divisions or kingdoms: the Northern, the Central and the Southern. When Theodore arrived he found the same divisions substantially unchanged. But the people by this time had all been converted to Christianity. It was impossible to carry out the four-square plan of Gregory because the people were heathen. Now it was not only possible but necessary to organize the whole island for ecclesiastical purposes. For the first three years of Theodore's stay, he did nothing but visit all parts of the island in order that he might become acquainted with the people and their needs. He was everywhere received with joy and reverence. Bede says, "He was the first of the archbishops whom the whole English church consented to obey." After he had settled all personal disputes among the bishops and brought about some order throughout the church, he called an assembly of all the bishops and leading members of the clergy at Hertford in 673. They came in large numbers. In this council it was decreed, after considerable discussion, that each bishop with his clergy should be restricted to his own diocese and that he should in no way interfere with the authority of a neighboring bishop. A still more important step was taken in the establishment of an annual council of all the bishops of Britain at Clovesho. This was a long step towards the unification of the church throughout the island, for at this council they passed regulations not merely for one bishopric

but for the whole church. These steps having been taken, Theodore next gave his attention to the permanent organization of the church. This organization involved an increase in the number of episcopal sees and a consequent breaking up of the great dioceses into numerous smaller ones. To accomplish this latter scheme Theodore had recourse to the older tribal boundaries which the English settlers had carefully preserved throughout their settlement, although many of these little kingdoms had been absorbed in the struggle which had been going on for political unity. The see of East Anglia was broken up into the dioceses of the North-Folk and the South-Folk. The great kingdom of the Mercians which was at this time under the rule of Wulfhere, and which consisted of one vast diocese under Bishop Wilfrid, Theodore broke up into four dioceses, that of Middle English with a seat at Leicester by establishing at Worcester a bishopric of the Hwiccias of the lower Severn valley, and another for the Hecanas at Hereford; while the peoples whom King Wulfhere had conquered from the kingdom of the West Saxons, and part of whom seemed to have been known as the South Engle, were committed to the charge of a bishop at Dorchester on the Thames. It would seem that Wilfrid was much opposed to the breaking up of his vast diocese and the consequent lessening of his power. To carry out this reform Theodore found it necessary to remove this stubborn bishop from his diocese and put another in his stead. Wilfrid, as we know, went to Rome, and afterwards took upon himself the conversion of the South Saxons which he accomplished in 681. After the reorganization of Mercia Theodore undertook the same task for Northumbria. Heretofore the bishopric of York extended over the whole of this territory. Two new bishoprics were now created, one at Lindisfarne, and the other far away at Abercorn, across the Firth of Forth, in the province of the Picts. There was a delay of three years in the reorganization of Northumbria, no doubt owing to a war which had sprung up between that country and Mercia over the government of the Lindiswara. Wessex resisted all the attempts of Theodore at reorganization, but some years after the archbishop's death it yielded

to necessity, and the whole nation was thereupon grouped in sixteen sees and made subject to the Archbishop of Canterbury. This arrangement was after a time modified so as to allow to York the position of an archbishopric, with three suffragan sees. Under Edward the Elder the plan of Theodore in its entirety was carried out, and the territorial organization of the dioceses as then fixed has remained to the present day with but few changes, and those of minor nature.

Theodore proved himself to be a man of great power and energy, the greatest man in England of his time. He labored unceasingly for the accomplishment of his great task, and that it was finally accomplished was due to his perseverance and skill. He it was who created the national church. Wilfrid, who had started the movement, but who was too selfish to aid in its entire completion, finally made his peace with the archbishop, and was restored to the see of York, thus finally recognizing the righteousness of Theodore's purpose. Theodore died in 688 at the advanced age of eighty-eight. But his work was of an abiding nature. *When he laid down his work the six unwieldy sees had been broken up into fifteen united under the close supervision of the Archbishop of Canterbury.* But important as was the work of Theodore for the church, even greater was his influence upon the future development of the Teutonic tribes of Britain. It was he who prepared the way for the political unification of England by revealing the process by which this could be accomplished. The unity of the English church in 688 meant the unity of the English people in the centuries to come.

Theodore also assisted in laying deep and stable the foundations of the future England. He established a penitential system which instilled into the barbaric mind a new conception of vice and crime as sin against God which could not be palliated by a simple payment of fines. He thus prepared a foundation for the future work of Edward I, of Glanville, and of Bracton, in the quickening moral sense of the people. He established a school at Canterbury which he placed under the direction of his friend, the abbot Hadrian, where instruction was given in Latin and Greek, arithmetic and astronomy, and the themes of Holy Scriptures. This was the fore-

runner of the great schools of Jarrow and York. The Gregorian music was also taught for the first time.

This chapter ought not to be closed without the mention of some other great men who contributed at this time to the elevation and enlightenment of their people. Benedict Biscop has already been mentioned as the companion of Wilfrid upon his first journey to Rome. He was a quiet and unassuming man who made no such noise in the world as did the stormy and quarrelsome Wilfrid, but he merited no less of future generations than did that renowned churchman. He was the first to introduce stained glass into England, by bringing glass workers from Gaul, in order to provide his own monastery and still more famous school at Jarrow, going himself to Rome to procure the necessary books and pictures for its library. It was he who made possible the work of Bede and Alcuin by his enlightenment and zeal. Cuthbert, who was consecrated bishop of Lindisfarne by Theodore, was the most famous native preacher of his time. He spent the greater part of his long life travelling through the remoter mountain settlements of Northumbria, "from whose roughness and poverty other teachers turned aside." He probably accomplished more toward the real Christianizing of the people and the ameliorating of their condition than any other man. While Theodore organized and Wilfrid preached, it was Cuthbert who taught the people by example how to live. It was at this time, also, that Caedmon, the peasant Milton, the cow-herd of Whitby, "sang of the creation of the world, the origin of man . . . of the terror of future punishment, the horror of hell pangs, and the joys of heaven." This was the first great English song and, although it was sung by the untutored lips of a peasant, it was full of the genuine music and heart pathos of the English race.

According to the oldest written history of Germanic Britain, the work of Bede, the heptarchic states were already manifesting a tendency to group themselves into three great masses, which were soon to be known as the kingdoms of Northern, Central, and Southern Britain. The northern kingdom reached from the Humber to the Firth of Forth.

The southern kingdom of the West Saxons reached from the coast of the channel to Watling Street. Between the kingdom of the West Saxons and the Northumbrians beyond the Humber, lay the kingdom of Mid-Britain which later became known by the name of its most powerful sub-division, Mercia. The same tendency toward centralization which wrought the seven or eight little kingdoms into the larger units, was still present and active. Each of these three kingdoms attempted, in turn, to work out the problem of national unity by so extending the boundaries of its own authority as to bring the sway of the whole English nation under that of its own royal house. The history of this struggle for supremacy stretches over a period of more than two hundred years. The first one of the three to undertake the task of unification was Northumbria, which reached its greatest extent under Edwin, the exiled son of Aella, the old king of Deira. After a fluctuating history of a quarter of a century, Northumbria abandoned the struggle for supremacy in 659 to Mercia and Wessex but still remained a powerful state.

While the Angles were making the settlements north of the Humber, which afterwards formed the kingdom of Northumbria, others settled to the south of that river, forming the kingdom of East Anglia upon the coast, and that of Mercia reaching to the head waters of the Trent. We have already seen how these Anglian kingdoms formed a last stronghold of paganism and consolidated into Mid-Britain, one of the three agglomerated kingdoms. A hundred years after the beginning of the Northumbrian overlordship, the Mercians became the great power of Mid-Britain under the leadership of Ethelbald, one of the most aggressive kings that had thus far arisen. His supremacy had been prepared by Wulfhere, 657-675, who, succeeding to the kingdom shortly after the death of Penda, reestablished the overlordship of Mercia over the tribes of Mid-England which had been lost by his father. He drove the West Saxons across the Thames and annexed to his own realm all their settlements which lay north of that river. The industrial progress of the Mercian kingdom went hand in hand with its

military advancement. The unbroken forests of the western border were being fast cleared away, the marshes of the eastern coast drained, by colonies of monks, who not only taught the people to clear and till the soil but engaged in these occupations themselves, thus giving continual proof of the hold which Christianity had taken upon these people. The abbey of Peterborough rose out of the fen-lands of the east, surrounded by clustering religious houses, while Guthlac, a youth of the royal Mercian blood, took refuge from the world in the solitudes of Crowland, and gained such reverence by reason of his pious acts, that a grateful people erected over his tomb the stately abbey of Crowlands. A great stone church took the place of the hermit's cell and the toil of the brotherhood gathered here soon changed the surrounding pools into fertile meadow-land.

Mercia, like Northumbria, had a fluctuating history but reached its greatest extent during the reign of Ethelbald, 773–755. He succeeded to the Mercian throne in 733 and immediately overran the whole of Wessex and only brought the war to a close by the recognition of his own supremacy not only on the part of Wessex but of all the English south of the Humber. But he was too ambitious and was defeated and slain in battle with the Northumbrians at Secundum in 757. Offa, who came to the throne upon the death of Ethelbald, was a powerful ruler and during his long reign he succeeded in raising Mercia to a position of great influence and power. He was successful in a series of struggles with the Welsh. He erected a huge dyke called Offa's Dyke from the mouth of the Wye to that of the Dee and settled colonies of Englishmen between this great dyke and the river Severn, thus forming an impregnable barrier against further inroads from the Welsh. He succeeded in reestablishing the supremacy of Mercia over Kent, East Anglia, Essex, and Sussex, but was foiled in his attempts to reconquer Wessex. He died in 796, having obtained to such authority throughout Britain that he aspired to a correspondence upon equal terms with Charles the Great. He left his kingdom to his son Cenwulf who kept the Mercian realm together during a period of twenty-five years, but was not able to extend his boundaries.

Mercian supremacy ceased in 829 when it was forced to yield and passed under the sway of Wessex.

The kingdom of the West Saxons grew out of a very small settlement of Saxons which established themselves west of the border lands of Kent, upon the coast of Hampshire. Cerdic and Cymric were their leaders. Here they remained without very much expansion for upwards of thirty years. They then pushed their invasions rapidly until that territory now comprising the shires of Wilts, Berks, Surrey, Oxford, Bedford, and Bucks fell into their hands. They next undertook the conquest of the lower Severn valley, which was won by the battle of Deorham in 577 and permanently added to Wessex. There now followed a period of internal dissension which lasted for nearly two hundred years and which kept Wessex weak and unfit either to contend successfully for the leadership of the English or to conquer the Welsh in Cornwall, who kept their independence until 815. Finally toward the end of the eighth century, Egbert, a descendant of the old warrior Ceawlin, attempted to snatch the crown from a rival branch of the house of Cerdic. In this he was unsuccessful and was driven to seek shelter at the court of the Mercian king, Offa. Driven from this refuge he went to the court of Charles the Great where he witnessed the memorable events which preceded the elevation of that great monarch to the throne of the Caesars in 800. Here he remained for fourteen years when he was summoned home to assume the crown which had recently fallen from the head of his rival, Beorhtric. He immediately took upon himself the subjugation of the West Welsh and continued this warfare for eight years until, in 815, the subjugation of Cornwall was completed and the supremacy of Wessex extended to the Land's End. At last all fear from Welsh attack in the rear was removed and Wessex was left free to undertake the subjugation of her rival kingdoms, Mercia and Northumberland. He first undertook the conquest of Mercia whose king had invaded his realm. The subjugation of this kingdom was completed in 829 without any further resistance. The dream of the union of all England now took possession of Egbert and he undertook to accomplish what Edwin and Edwy, Penda, Ethelbald, and Offa had been unable to do. North-

umbria was still strong. It stood at the head of the English race in learning and the arts of civilization. The inroads of the Northmen, however, had weakened the spirit of the Northumbrians. They had witnessed the ruin of their celebrated school at Jarrow and the destruction of Holy Island. The kingdom was rent with civil strife and the Northumbrians themselves seemed to despair under their weak king of being able to defend themselves against the Northmen. Under these conditions they decided to take the decisive step of placing their kingdom under Egbert. The Northumbrian thegns met him in Derbyshire and formally recognized the supremacy of Wessex, owning Egbert as their king. With the submission of Northumbria, the work which other great kings had failed to do was now accomplished and the whole English race was knit together under one rule. Each conquered state entered into dependent relations with Wessex without, however, sacrificing its autonomy. Thus was formed a loose confederation of subject kingdoms under the leadership of Wessex. The three centers of confederation at last gave way to one, which was a long step toward the unification of the years of strife to bring this loosely confederated state into one strong well-knit power.

## CHAPTER XXIV

### THE ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE PAPACY

“**A**ll beginnings are difficult.” This comes quickly home to anyone who undertakes to sketch the history of a great institution that has profoundly influenced the life of the world. Beginnings lie deep-hidden, reaching far back of the obvious appearance of any historical institution. This is pre-eminently true of the institution of the Papacy. It is fairly well defined when Alaric makes his famous descent upon Rome and captures the city in 410. But more than two hundred years before the establishment of the Papal Monarchy upon the ruins of Old Rome, the primacy of the Roman church was quite generally recognized throughout Christendom. (The outcome of the struggle with Marcion was the recognition of three Apostolic churches, Antioch, Alexandria, and Rome, the last-named being the only one located in the West.) The bishops of these three churches and their successors became the established authority for the interpretation of all Scriptures. Going back, then, to the primitive organization of the church, we find that almost from the beginning it was Greek. The church had its origin among a Syrian people, although Jesus and his immediate followers spoke Aramaic. But the primal records of Christianity were all written in Greek and this religion spread with utmost rapidity and success among nations of Greek descent, or those which had been brought under Greek influence by Alexander. The most flourishing churches were in Greek cities. By the middle of the second century Christianity had wholly passed from its Jewish environment and had become completely Greek in its thought and in its language. Justin Martyr, a converted Greek philosopher, who suffered for his faith in 165, had more influence upon the church of the second and third centuries than did the

Apostle Paul. Greek was the language of commerce in which the Jews, the masters of trade, who were settled in every province of the Roman world, carried on their business enterprises. Greek colonists were planted in nearly every island of the Mediterranean and upon the coasts of Italy, Spain, and Gaul. In all these places Greek-speaking Christian communities sprang up. Christianity in their hands became philosophic and speculative.

In polity the churches throughout the Greek empire became, like the Greek cities of old, a federation of republics. But they were founded on a religious basis and not a national one. In their foundations they followed, as they became established, the boundaries of the Imperial dioceses. These little democratic republics were bound together by no political bonds but rather "those of common sympathies, common creeds, common social bonds, common rites, common usages of life, and a hierarchy everywhere, in theory at least, of the same power and influence." Christians from one of these little communities were admitted into any other by means of "a letter of credit" from the bishop or presiding elder of the community from which the traveler came. These communities were often bound together by the bonds of charity as were the Pauline communities to that of Jerusalem. Still, after all has been said, each of these little religious republics was absolutely independent. The Roman East had no capital as did the West, around which could grow one common religious center. Antioch in Syria and Alexandria in Egypt, by reason of their wealth and political importance, had, perhaps, an undue influence among the church communities, but, until the conflict with Marcion and other gnostic teachers gave to the churches of these cities especial distinction as conservators of the true Apostolic doctrine, there was no subordination of one church to another; no supremacy. The union of the various Christian communities which tended to form one universal church was a voluntary association. In most churches the bishop had evolved from the board of presbyters and risen to special distinction as the business head of the church, but the whole episcopal order was on precisely the same level.

Eastern Christianity when once established and mistress within the boundaries of the empire ceased to be aggressive and did nothing toward the conversion of the outside barbarians. The real Christian spirit seems to have been lost and controversy took the place of piety. Christians were so busy settling the Attributes of God, and the person, nature, and will of Christ, that they had neither time, patience, nor inclination to give to Christian living. While the topic lies beyond the present theme the historian does not have to hunt for the reason of the success of Mohammedanism. The lower clergy had wealth and influence sufficient to live in ease, and to plan ambitious schemes, but not enough to win the people to any active striving for the repression of immorality and the establishment of right and justice between man and man. For the most part lazy and vicious, they sunk into the common ignorance and superstition of a worn-out civilization. Barbarism was an improvement upon this. Monasticism arose in the East. Its history is seen in another chapter (XIX). Here it is sufficient to say that while it held many excellent qualities, it drew from civil life thousands of men who ought to have been energetic and useful citizens, into a barren and useless indolence. Instead of helping to build up society and redeem the waste places of the earth, they stood aloof from the world and its activity; the anchorites dwelling in caves or desert wildernesses, and striving to win heaven by starving all the natural appetites of the flesh and contemplating the Divine; the monks, in their lonely and securely guarded convents, bent upon the same selfish object, the salvation of their own souls. These seemed content to let the rest of mankind sink to inevitable ruin.

Turning now to the Western portion of the Roman empire, let us inquire into the workings of Christianity during the same period as that just discussed. From the first, Rome was the center of Christian activity in the West, and she had never had any rivals. The church, if not founded, was surely nourished and built up by the presence and help of St. Peter and St. Paul. It was located in the capital city of the world, thus having a tremendous advantage over every other Christian community. It very early in its history

gained a reputation for its abounding liberality to the poor and oppressed, not only of its own community, but also of Christians everywhere. Her authority soon reached out beyond the city of Rome. Clement, who won a martyr's crown in 96, was able to give not only advice and consolation, but also directions to the church at Corinth. Little by little the Roman community reached out to the churches in northern Africa, Spain, and Gaul, to Carthage, Cordova, Toulouse, Milan, and Lyons, making her influence and power felt in all these places. The organization of the Roman church was still that of the Greek communities of the East. She was still a member of the federation of little Greek Christian republics, but she was continually growing toward monarchy, in imitation, perhaps, of the imperial autocracy which she saw about her. The language of the Roman church was still Greek, her organization Greek, and not only her scriptures, but also her Christian books and letters were all Greek. It was not till the time of Tertullian that Latin came into use in the church to any great extent. Throughout Gaul, also, Christians were settled chiefly in the Greek towns which recognized Marseilles as their parent city. All these retained Greek as their vernacular tongue. There was a colony of Greeks at Lyons where Irenæus lived and wrote in the Greek language. The tongue of Christianity was thus Greek and the Roman church had through this medium a means of communication with all the Christian communities. While Rome herself was free from the various heresies which arose in the East from gnosticism to Montanism, yet all the heretics went to Rome and at least endeavored to promulgate and establish their sects. Each one tried to gain the support and influence of the bishop of Rome, so that the Roman church was perhaps disturbed more by these than was any other church. This was also true with the great controversies. Rome held herself aloof from these, caring little and understanding little. But this position of cold neutrality only caused her to be appealed to as an unprejudiced arbiter by the rabid portions of the East. She did little or nothing, in the long and heated debates in synods and councils to establish orthodoxy. She merely adopted the views of the majority of the

great Eastern churches, and, in the end, gained the reputation of being the most orthodox; the only church, in fact, that escaped without a smell of fire upon her garments.

Thus the church of St. Peter at Rome kept a dignified and somewhat worthy existence as the mistress of Western Christianity from Constantine the Great to Augustus the Little. Church historians have either been silent or have misrepresented the Christian church during these two hundred years. Look at a map of the Roman empire at the accession of Constantine the Great when Christianity became a State religion. Look again at a map of the Roman empire, in 400, before the Germans smashed the frontier and captured the "Eternal City." The boundaries are about the same. Within those boundaries life has gone on under the protection of the Roman eagles for one hundred years, and for that length of time Christianity has been the State religion; her bishops and her priests are on the pay roll of the empire. It is true that the empire of Constantine has been broken into two empires, the Eastern and the Western. The Christian church has been broken into the Greek church and the Latin church. But these divisions are only artificial and so far as Christianity is concerned, what is said of one portion may be said with equal truth of the other. The population of the empire has fallen off one third, largely because so-called Christian women refused the duty of bearing children. The evils which threatened the life of the empire in its early days have gone on unchecked despite the fact that the population of the empire is now Christian. The State is about to die of moral rottenness and yet the State is Christian. From the establishment of Christianity as the State religion to the fall of that State, the Christian church did not send out one missionary to bear the "message of Christ" to the pagan and barbarian millions which pressed upon every boundary of the Roman empire. The Christian church had control of vast wealth. Cyril of Alexandria was able to pay from the revenues of his see fifteen hundred pounds in gold and silver, as a light valuation, to corrupt the government of the city and overthrow an ecclesiastical rival. Yet the historian can find no case of the expenditure of one

single dollar for the conversion of the throngs of people that lay just outside the pale of the empire or the amelioration of their degraded condition. What could have been accomplished had the clergy been anything else than lazy and profligate, and the Christian communities other than selfish and immoral is seen in the wholesale conversion of the Germans in the sixth and seventh centuries by the brilliant work of Rome.

By the beginning of the fourth century the idea was becoming dominant that the priesthood formed a separate class, representing the visible church. This was in accordance with the theocratic idea. Thus the priests were looked upon as the link between "the kingdom of God on earth and its divine head, and as the channel through which the Holy Spirit was communicated to the world." It was becoming the common thought of the church that the clergy should keep apart from the ordinary secular affairs and exhibit to the world a higher form of morality than was required or expected of the common Christian. This feeling on the part of the people engendered a false pride on the part of clergymen by reason of their superior sanctity. Through the influence of the church councils and the teachings of great leaders like Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine, it became quite widely recognized as a doctrine that bishops, presbyters, and deacons should remain unmarried. This met with much opposition in the East where the example of pious and respected bishops was opposed to it. In the West especially the ethical ideal of the age was the ascetic, and this made demands of a special kind upon the clergy, especially in regard to celibacy. The Spanish Council of Elvira passed a canon demanding that married bishops, presbyters, and deacons abstain from all intercourse with their wives after ordination. With this canon went the supposition that those marriages had been entered into when they were laymen. Siricius, who was chosen Bishop of Rome upon the death of Damasus, in 385, proved to be a strong prelate with ambitious notions for the importance and dignity of the Roman see. Himerius, Bishop of Tarragona in Spain, had written a letter to Damasus but shortly before that pontiff's

death, asking his advice upon the question of the celibacy of the clergy. This letter came into the hands of Siricius for a reply. This was just the opportunity which the Bishop of Rome was awaiting. In answer to Himerius, who only asked for advice, he despatched a *decretal* couched in language implying that “the usages of Rome were to be considered as precedents for all other churches.” The subject of the *decretal* related, as has been said, to the celibacy of the clergy. Marriage was to them peremptorily interdicted. This doctrine is of special importance because it is the admittedly genuine *decretal* or letter of the Bishop of Rome, regarded as having *the force of law for the Western church*. To this separation of its ministers, and a caste conception of the priesthood which resulted therefrom, was not a little due the splendor and the strength of the Western church as a world-power in the Middle Ages; and of this power her Chief Pastor became more and more the executive and the expression. Rome having once placed her hand on anything never let go if by policy or force she could retain her hold. In 379, the political diocese of Illyricum was separated from the Western and given over to the Eastern division of the empire. Damasus had, however, insisted upon its retention as ecclesiastically subject to Rome, and had appointed as his vicar, Ascholius, Bishop of Thessalonica, and after him, Bishop Anysius. Now Siricius renewed the vicariate of this prelate upon his elevation to the Chair of St. Peter, and when Anastacius became Bishop of Rome he followed the same policy, though his power was of short duration. He died in 402, and was succeeded by Innocent I. The Council of Sardica, in 347, gave to Julius, the Bishop of Rome, the privilege of appointing judges to try the cases of condemned bishops, if he thought their appeals worthy of special consideration. Indeed he could institute a revision of the verdict of synods, even though no appeal were made to him. This really placed the final decision of all cases in the hands of the Bishop of Rome. This honor to the memory of St. Peter was paid in good faith, but it meant more than the Council dreamed.

It was at the beginning of the fifth century when the life

of the mighty Roman empire was drawing to a close in the ignoble hands of Honorius, and the Northern Barbarians were ready to over-run and settle down upon the ruins of a State that had controlled the fortunes of the civilized world for more than seven hundred years, that Innocent I was chosen to the Chair of St. Peter. This high position of power and influence was attained by reason of high moral and spiritual qualities, as Innocent was a man of unimpeachable holiness. But circumstances combined in his favor and the course of public events was such as immediately to strengthen the seat of the Bishop by undermining the throne of Caesar, and by finally driving him from the ancient imperial capital. Innocent was born at Albano within the Roman territory and, consequently, had the honor of Roman blood and lineage. He had in very marked degree the cold, clear, common sense, dignified bearing, and imperious nature of the Roman patrician. He thoroughly understood his position and was determined to push to the uttermost the Papal claims. It was on the mind of Innocent that first dawned "the vast conception of Rome's universal ecclesiastical supremacy, dim as yet and shadowy, yet full and comprehensive in its outline." His claims were such, and so far made good, that we are justified in bestowing upon him the title of Pope, "the earliest Roman Bishop that can with propriety be so called." His predecessors had done something toward the elevation of the Roman See; the Councils of Sardica and Elvira had added important patterns. In these tracks Innocent advanced with success and ever-growing self-confidence. He commissioned the Bishop of Thessalonica as his vicar for the Illyrian provinces, communicated his ordinances for observance to the Western provinces and laid claim to the power of deciding as superior judge in *major cases*. This claim was based upon the Canon of Sardica, which was for the time regarded as Nicene. He enforced the duty of sending information as to important events to Rome. He championed in a worthy manner the cause of John Chrysostom in his controversy with Theophilus, Bishop of Alexandria, and in the Pelagian controversy, both sides referred the matter to his arbitration.

This summary of his acts tells us better than wordy descriptions the purpose and the power of Innocent. He declares in one of his earliest epistles, "that all the churches of the West, not of Italy alone, but of Gaul, Spain, and Africa, having been planted by St. Peter and his successors, owed filial obedience to the parent See, are bound to follow her example in all points of discipline, and to maintain a rigid uniformity with all her usages." It is but a brief time before a representative of each of these provinces gives evidence of the truth of the position of Innocent. The Bishop of Rouen requests from the Bishop of Rome, the rules of ecclesiastical discipline observed within the Roman see. To this Innocent replies commending "the zeal of the Gaulish Bishop, for uniformity, so contrary to the lawless spirit of innovation which prevailed in some parts of the Christian world." He sent him a book of regulations, very severe in its nature, especially concerning the celibacy of the clergy. Exuperius, Bishop of Toulouse, is highly commended because instead of usurping undue authority he has appealed to the See of Rome, and so on.

At midnight on the 24th of August, 410, Alaric, with his army of West Goths, entered Rome by the Salarian Gate, outside of which Hannibal had encamped six hundred years before, and took the Imperial City. Eleven hundred and sixty-four years had passed since its legendary foundation by the miraculous twins that had been suckled by a wolf; four hundred and forty-one years had gone by since the battle of Actium which made Caesar Augustus Lord of the Roman World. When the Gothic trumpets sounded on that fateful night they announced that ancient history had come to an end, and that our modern time was born. Even in that age of weakness and of immense and growing confusion, the nations held their breath when these tidings broke upon them. Those noble Romans, adherents of the heathen religion, who still survived, felt in them a judgment of the gods, and charged upon the Christians the long sequel of calamities which had come down upon the once invincible empire. The Christians reported that Rome's fall was the chastisement for idolatry. The supreme philosopher of Western

Christendom, the African Father St. Augustine, wrote his monumental work, *The City of God*, by way of proving that there was a Divine kingdom which heathen Rome could persecute in the martyrs, but the final triumph of which it could never prevent. This magnificent conception, wrought out in a vein of prophecy, and with an elegance which has never lost its power, furnished the succeeding times an Apocalypse, no less than a justification of the Gospel. Instead of the heathen Rome, it set up an ideal Christendom. But the center, the meeting place of old and new, was the "City on the Seven Hills."

To the Roman Empire when it finally fell into ruin, succeeded the Papal Monarchy. The pope called himself *Pontifex Maximus*, at once claimed to be the heir of that hierarchic name, the oldest in Europe, and which signified "The Priest that offered sacrifice on the Sublician bridge." The name denotes in a symbolic fashion what the Papacy was destined to achieve as well as the inward strength on which it relied during the thousand years that stretch between the invasion of the Barbarians and the Renaissance. When we speak of the Middle Ages we mean this second, spiritual and Christian Rome, in conflict with the Northern tribes of Germans, and then their teacher; the mother of civilization; the source to Western nations of religion, law, and order; of learning, art, and civic institutions. It gave to the multitude of tribes which wandered over, or settled down within the boundaries of the West, from Lithuania to Ireland, from Illyria to Portugal, and from Sicily to the North Cape, a brain, a conscience, and imagination which at length transformed them into that Christendom which Augustine pictures in his *City of God*.

The account of the sack of Rome by Alaric and his Visigoths must be read in the classic pages of Gibbon, or Hodgkin's *Italy and her Invaders*. Space precludes the discussion here. The Visigoths must not be considered as barbarian tribes pure and simple. They were of the finest Germanic stock and had been converted to Arian Christianity for more than fifty years and had the Bible in their own language, and a fairly well-developed Christian priesthood.

The terrible picture of plundering, burning, rapine, and murder, drawn by ancient writers, must have been greatly overdrawn or Gaeseric and his Vandals would have found nothing to award their cupidity a generation later. The pagan Romans were driven out or destroyed. Many of them deserted the city, taking as much of their wealth as they could carry. They wandered over the East, and were finally lost from sight. During the sacking of the city Innocent was absent, having accompanied a deputation to Ravenna, to seek some protection for the capitol. When he finally returned, Alaric and his soldiers had accomplished their work and passed on to other fields.

But Innocent did not return to rule over a desert, says Milman: "The wonder, which is expressed at the rapid restoration of Rome, shows that the general consternation and awe at the tidings of the capture, had greatly exaggerated the amount both of damage and of depopulation. Some of the palaces of the nobles, who had fled from the city, or perished in the siege, may have remained in ruins; above all, the temples, now without funds to repair them from their confiscated estates, from the alienated government, or from the munificence of wealthy worshipers, would be left exposed to every casual injury, and fall into irremediable dilapidation, unless seized and appropriated to its own uses by the triumphant faith. Now probably began the slow conversion of the heathen fanes into Christian churches. The capture of Rome by Alaric was one of the great steps by which the pope arose to his plenitude of power. There could be no question that from this time the greatest man in Rome was the pope; he alone possessed all the attributes of supremacy, the reverence; it was his own fault, if not the love of the people. He had a sacred indefeasible title; authority unlimited, because undefined; wealth, which none dare to usurp, which multitudes lavishly contributed to increase by free-will offerings; he is in one sense a Caesar, whose apotheosis has taken place in his lifetime, environed by his Praetorian guards, his ecclesiastics, on whose fidelity and obedience he may, when once seated on the throne, implicitly rely; whose edicts are gradually received as law; and who has his spiritual Praetors

and Proconsuls in almost every part of Western Christendom."

In the spring of 417 Innocent died, after a memorable reign of fifteen years. During this time he had raised the pontifical throne to a height of power and influence which it had never before enjoyed. Indeed, it was he who shaped the policy of the Holy See, and fixed the line of development by which it came in the Middle Ages to something like the leadership of the world. It was he who first dreamed of that universal ecclesiastical supremacy of Rome which was destined to be turned later into sober fact by his successors, who followed in the pathway which he himself marked out.

Between the close of the Apostolic age and the death of Innocent the Roman see had undergone a purely natural process of development similar to that of any other great historical institution. In the early centuries it gives no indication of its own self-consciousness of the unique origin and almost superhuman destiny which have since been claimed for it. While Innocent sat in the Roman Chair a change was taking place in the character of the claims set forth by its bishop. By taking advantage of every precedent and building therefrom an imposing hypothesis from a line of reasoning satisfactory at least to himself "Innocent found an episcopate in Rome and left a Papacy." This was due to no new facts but rather to a new interpretation of the fact. The *Petrine succession of the Bishops of Rome was generally accepted throughout Christendom.* This is seen in the writings of Tertullian and Cyprian. Of this Innocent was doubtless fully aware and he was not the man to let any such advantage slip by unappreciated. When he wrote his letter to Victorius within a year following his accession, he does not justify himself for so doing by any reference to spiritual prerogatives which were his as the successor of the Prince of the apostles, but merely pleads a decree of a council, as the supreme authority in all ecclesiastical matters. "This seemed to prove quite conclusively that although the Roman episcopate of the apostle teacher was received as an unquestioned fact at the opening of the sixth century, no conclusion was at first drawn therefrom as to a spiritual autocracy

vested in the Bishop of Rome." After the lapse of twelve years, full of momentous events, Innocent writes more letters and in them we discover a startling change. To Alexander, bishop of Antioch, he writes confirming him in the prerogative of his see but he did this expressly because "Saint Peter had sat a while as Bishop there before he transferred his chair to Rome." The Petrine episcopate is in this respect revealed in a new light, "as bestowing an increased measure of executive authority, even when it had been exercised but for a short season and in a transitional kind of way." Still more definite is his letter to the Italian bishop Ducentius, written a year later. In this letter Innocent asserts his claim to authority, directly based upon the bequest of the Prince of the apostles, "to whom and his successors all the churches throughout the West trace their origin; and as the successor of their common founder in the bishopric of the ancient capital of the world the writer claims to exercise a plenary authority over all."

Innocent was preeminently the man of his time. His policy was one which commended itself as right and orthodox and so had the support of the clergy in general, as well as the confidence and respect if not the love of the common people.

We must now halt and see how far the church has gone in the way of organization. The empire was divided by Constantine for purposes of administration into four prefectures and twelve dioceses. The provinces into which the diocese was divided and which were the administrative divisions of the metropolitan, described in a previous chapter, were found to be too small for practical purposes, in the turmoil of the Arian controversy. The provincial council, presided over by the metropolitan, and large hierarchical organizations, were brought into use to cope with this heresy. In the East the lines of the political diocese were followed. The bishop of the chief city of the diocese, therefore, was raised above all other metropolitans, although his rights varied somewhat in different dioceses. These were greatest in the diocese of Egypt of which Alexandria was the capital. In the diocese of Thrace, the newly founded city of Constantinople became the capital in place of Heraclea, and the Bishop of Con-

stantinople became the diocesan bishop. This diocesan arrangement was approved by the council of Constantinople of 381, and diocesan synods, as the highest ecclesiastical courts, were raised above the councils of the provinces. This same council gave to the Bishop of Constantinople first rank among the twelve diocesan bishops, his station being second only to that of Rome. (Objected to by Leo.) The Council of Chalcedon, in 451, recognized this arrangement and conferred, in addition, the right to receive appeals and complaints from the whole Eastern church. By this act new Rome was placed on a level with Ancient Rome in real power. Shortly after this the more appropriate title of "Patriarch" was applied exclusively to the bishops of the five most distinguished metropolitan sees, which then went under the name of *patriarchates*. Besides Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch, Constantinople was also, because of its political importance, raised to the dignity of a Patriarchal see. Jerusalem was later raised to Patriarchal rank. The boundaries of these great Patriarchates were generally fixed by those of the political divisions of the empire. But disputes over jurisdiction and priority continually arose. (See map.)

In the history of universal Christianity the Pontificate of Leo the Great is one of the great landmarks. Of all the great ecclesiastical sees just mentioned, Rome alone maintained something of the sanctity and piety belonging to the religion of Christ. The great Eastern patriarchates were engaged in shameful and unseemly strife and doing less than nothing for the building of God's kingdom on earth. The Roman empire might well be considered as ending with Theodosius the Great, as the boy sovereigns of the East and West were but puppets in the hands of ambitious conspirators. Hippo had fallen into the hands of the Vandals but shortly after the death of Augustine.

Leo, like Innocent, was a Roman of good family. He was early dedicated to the services of the church and, while yet a youth, succeeded in so distinguishing himself as to gain the attention of those high in the councils of the church. While yet an acolyte he was sent to Africa with letters con-

denning Pelagianism. He became acquainted with St. Augustine and Bishop Aurelius and was carried along by these great churchmen into a participation in their unseemly hatred of Pelagianism. Upon his return he urged upon Pope Sixtus the persecution of Julianus. Cassian dedicated to him while yet a deacon his work on the Incarnation. Upon the death of Sixtus, while absent from Rome on an important mission, he was chosen to fill the vacant Chair of St. Peter by the unanimous vote of all Rome, the clergy, the senate, and the people. He immediately assumed the duties of the high office, without accustomed expression of unfitness for the task, and with absolute self-confidence in his own ability and training, and faith in God and assurance that He would give him strength to fulfil the difficult tasks. Leo was both administrator and theologian, and he had already become known in both these fields before his election to the Papal throne. He had corresponded with Cyril of Alexandria and John Cassian, with both on important matters. He had taken a deep interest in the Nestorian controversy and was in sympathy with the two leaders of the enemies of Nestorius. Leo may also be styled the first preacher of the West. For some reason, possibly mixture of tongues, more probably the lack of oratorical ability, preaching was not made use of in the Latin church. This was in strange contrast with the East where preaching was universal in the churches and was the most certain road to ecclesiastical advancement. The bishops of all the great churches were eloquent preachers. Nestorius was distinguished as an eloquent and forceful preacher before he was accused of heresy. Arius, Cyril, and Theodoret were striking examples of the eloquent preacher. John Chrysostom was called from his pulpit at Antioch to the See of Constantinople because his wonderful eloquence had prepared the way. Leo must have given some proof of his power as a speaker before he was chosen Pope. There are ninety-six genuine sermons of Leo still extant to bear witness to his unwonted pulpit activity. He deals mostly with the cardinal doctrines of the Christian faith, and even the most casual glance through his sermons fills the reader with wonder that, amid his many other cares,

he could find time and mental detachment necessary to their composition. The Incarnation, Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension of our Lord, the gift of the Holy Spirit, the Doctrine of the Trinity, and the Person of Christ are some of the topics with which he deals. These sermons, compared with those of some Eastern divines upon the same subject, seem rather weak and prolix, lacking originality and force, but they reveal the earnest and simple piety of the man. His concept of the atonement is at once both strange and silly. This, he claims, was effected by means of a trick played off upon the devil, who mistook Christ for a sinner like other men, and treating him as such exceeded his rights. In this way he forfeited his claims upon man and was, consequently, compelled to set him free. Other sermons, while ascetic in type, are full of good Roman common sense and in every way admirable. Other sermons set forth very clearly his views touching the foundations of the church. Leo customarily preached a sermon upon each anniversary of his accession. In these he set forth with clearness and vigor the grandeur of his official prerogative as successor of the "Prince of the Apostles." "He is Peter in St. Peter's chair and bears full responsibility as such. Peter in a sense lives on in the person of his successors, and his privilege is the abiding possession of his Apostolic See. Peter alone is the rock and foundation of the church, the Warden of the Celestial Gate, and the last earthly authority in all questions of binding and loosing. To Peter it was that our Lord said, 'I have prayed for you that your faith fail not,' though he spoke with reference to a peril which threatened his fellow Apostles, equally with Peter himself: whence we may infer that this Apostle was the object of his Master's especial care, and that special prayer was made on his behalf that by his firmness in confronting temptation his colleagues also might be rendered firm. Peter it was who was singled out for the commission which strengthened his brethren and to feed the flock of Christ. Peter is therefore the Chief Shepherd who is set over the shepherds of that flock, not one of whom has any business which is not his business as well. He

is at once the pattern and the source of all ecclesiastical authority."

In other words Peter was appointed by Christ as prince of the Universal Church with power to "bind and loose" as seemed best to him. As to the city of Rome, upon the memorial day of St. Peter and St. Paul he gave the following:

"These are the men, O Rome, through whom the gospel of Christ hath shone upon thee. These are thy holy fathers and thy true shepherds, who have set thee in heavenly kingdoms far more gloriously than those who laid the first foundations of thy walls. These are they who have advanced thee to such glory that, as a holy nation, a chosen people, a priestly and royal state, thou shouldst hold a broader sway in faith of God than in dominion of the earth. Whatever the victories that have borne forward thy right of empire by land and sea, yet less the toil of war has yielded thee than the peace of Christ. For the good, just, and almighty God, who never denied his mercy to human kind, and always by his abundant benefits, has instructed all men in the knowledge of himself, by a more secret counsel and a deeper love took pity on the willing blindness of wanderers and their proneness to evil, by sending his Word, equal and co-eternal with himself. And that the fruit of this unspeakable grace might be shed through all the earth, he with divine foresight prepared the Roman realm, whose growth was carried to limits that bordered upon the universe of all nations on every side. But this city, knowing not the Author of her greatness, while queen of almost every nation, was slave to the errors of every people, and seemed to herself to have attained great faith, because she had spurned no falsehood. And so, the more strictly she was held in bonds by Satan, so much the more marvellously she is set free by Christ."

We need search no farther for the views of Leo, nor can we doubt his good faith in putting them forth. He speaks with utmost conviction, and as a man who has the undoubted right to speak as he does. His sermons contain enough to give the person who reads them a very fair conception of the extent to which Leo in all good faith magnified his office

in his pulpit. His faith in the “Divine right of Popes” was without limit, but honest. Let us now see how he put his theory into practice.

Leo was the very soul of orthodoxy. He could not live long in his position without finding himself in conflict with one or another of the various heresies by which the peace of the church was disturbed. Pelagianism was dying, but not yet dead. This heresy, through the influence of Augustine, was bitterly hated by Leo. Septimus, bishop of Altena, wrote to inform the pope of certain irregularities which were taking place in the province of Aquileia, to which he belonged. He reported “that discipline was lax, Pelagian clergy were being admitted into Church fellowship without renunciation of their errors, and no check placed upon their activities.” To Septimus Leo replied in cordial terms, expressing warm appreciation of his careful shepherding of the “flock of Christ.” To the Metropolitan of Aquileia he also wrote in a most peremptory tone, “charging him to take prompt measure to remedy what was amiss and by ‘the authority of our commission,’ to assemble a provincial council, and to compel all clergy, of whatever rank, who had been received from among the Pelagians into the Catholic communion, to publicly adjure their errors, and openly to accept all conciliar decrees which *have been ratified by the Apostolic See* for the purpose of uprooting this heresy.” This letter in tone is that of a superior to an inferior, of a captain to his lieutenant.

The next case is one arising at his door. This is the heresy of Manichaeism (sketch in Chapter XVII). The hand of Leo lay heavy upon the whole body of these misbelievers; “Some were treated with lenity, being admitted to penance and for-swearng their errors; others were driven into exile; others fled, being followed, however, by letters in which the pope urged upon the Italian bishops the necessity of rigorous search being made for the fugitives.” Behind the pope stood the emperor, Valentinian III, who, at the request of Leo, “issued an edict confirmatory of those laws of his predecessors by which the Manichaeans were to be banished from the whole world. They were to be liable to all the

penalties of sacrilege. It was a public offense. The accusers were not to be liable to the charge of delation. It was a crime to conceal or harbor them. All Manichaeans were to be expelled from the army, and not permitted to inhabit cities; they could neither make testaments nor receive bequests." The cause of the severity of the law was their flagrant and disgraceful immorality.

The next question of issue was one of jurisdiction between the pope and Hilary, the Metropolitan of Arles. Papal and metropolitan authority now clashed and men at the head of these two forces were of much the same temper. Hilary was born of a noble family and described as "endowed with every public and private virtue." He was induced by his friend Honorius to give up his worldly prospects of wealth and political advancement, and to retire to the monastery of Lerins. Shortly after this move on Hilary's part, Honorius was elevated to the archbishopric of Arles. Upon his death-bed he sent for Hilary, and named him as his successor; this nomination was ratified and Hilary, much against his will, was compelled to accept the office, in 429. For the next fifteen years he filled the responsible position with great success, bemeaning himself as "a man of peace and lofty spirit, fearless in rebuking whatever was amiss, and resolute to maintain order and discipline." Like Leo, Hilary did not underestimate his authority as Metropolitan Bishop of Arles. There was a tradition that Trophemius, the companion of Paul, was the first Bishop of Arles, and so this city was the starting-point and headquarters for Christianity in Gaul. On the strength of this tradition the bishops of Arles early showed a disposition to look upon their city as being somewhat more than a mere provincial metropolis. For this same reason they looked upon themselves as "the rightful primates of Gaul enjoying an authority patriarchal rather than metropolitan in character." Pope Zosimus had recognized this claim on the part of Arles and had laid it upon the other churches of Gaul to recognize the superior jurisdiction of the Bishop of Arles. But Boniface seems to have withdrawn this recognition of his predecessor. Arles, however, persisted in its claim and Hilary acted upon this wider au-

thority and took to himself powers which the other bishops refused to recognize. This trouble culminated when Hilary, in company with Germanus of Auxerre, was making a round of visitations. A complaint was brought to Hilary against one Celidonius, bishop of Besançon, on the ground that "he was disqualified for the Episcopal office which he held, by having married a widow while yet a layman, and also having, as civil magistrate, passed sentence of death." Hilary thereupon summoned a provincial council at Besançon (probably) which deposed Celidonius. But this bishop declined to step down and out. Instead he went to Rome and placed his case before the pope. Hilary, hearing of this move on the part of Celidonius, immediately set out on foot to Rome and despite the severity of the winter, made his way to the capital. He at once sought out Leo and informed him that he had not come "to plead at his tribunal, nor to accuse, but to protest against any infringements of his rights." Notwithstanding this protest of Hilary, a local council was convened to hear the case. Hilary was permitted to have a seat in this council, but was called upon to rebut evidence that was placed against him, thus practically placing him on trial. He proceeded to speak his mind to Leo touching his procedure "without fear and a haughtiness equal to that of the pope himself." This did the cause no good. The conclusion of the case was practically reached before the trial was on. The sentence of the council of Besançon was reversed and Celidonius was reinstated. This act on the part of Leo was a high-handed assumption of power, and was directly in the face of the accepted canons of various church councils. The fifty-third canon of Elvira and the sixteenth canon of Arles I asserted that the restoration of an excommunicate could only be legitimately given by the bishop who had excommunicated him. The fifth canon of Nicea declares "that in cases in which the penalty of excommunication has been imposed it must be recognized by all other bishops." The acts of many other councils are in harmony with those cited. Leo could never justify himself upon any other grounds than his own theory of the primacy of St. Peter. His was an arbitrary assumption of appellate

jurisdiction without any limitation. A second case seems to have been placed against Hilary almost immediately upon the settlement of that of Celidonius. For this there is no evidence save the letters of Leo. Projectus, bishop of Die, in the province of Treves, brought an information against Hilary to the pope. He stated that while he lay sick, Hilary usurped the authority in a province other than his own, and without regard to the usual forms of canonical election, had consecrated another in his room. There is no statement on the part of Hilary of this case, and no evidence produced to prove the charge. On its face it looks like a trumped up charge, unworthy of consideration, but Projectus won his case before Leo, and *Hilary was removed from his office as metropolitan and forbidden to take any further part in any ordination.*

Leo was uneasy in his mind, no doubt, regarding his action in the case of Hilary. Calmer judgment may have left him dissatisfied with his hasty actions. To make the way perfectly clear he had access to the imperial arm. He influenced the emperor Valentinian to put forth an edict, July 8, 445, which is as follows: "A Holy Council has confirmed the primacy of the Apostolic See from regard to the merit of St. Peter and the dignity of the city of Rome; so that no one should presume to do aught unpermitted by her authority. Hilary is denounced as guilty of contumacy and lawlessness, and as a disturber of the peace of the churches. This is a civil as well as an ecclesiastical offense, which has been duly investigated by the pope, whose sentence would be valid even without imperial sanction. But, inasmuch as Hilary has offended against the majesty of the empire as well as against the Apostolic See, the emperor's attention has been called thereto and he now reminds Hilary that to the mildness of the Roman Pontiff alone it is due that he still bears the name of bishop. He and others were alike warned to heed this perpetual edict, that it shall not be lawful for bishops in Gaul, and elsewhere, contrary to ancient custom, to do aught without the authority of the venerable pope of the Eternal City, whose enactments shall be laws for all. If any bishop summoned for trial by the pope, neglect to

attend, he shall be compelled to appear at once by the Governor of the province to which he belongs."

It must be admitted that from the point of view of the pope, he won a decided victory in his contest with Hilary. The emperor had recognized him as holding authority co-ordinate with himself. It would seem by this that Peter and Augustus had agreed together to share the "lordship of the world." *This celebrated edict of Valentinian, rather than our Lord's supposed commission to the Prince of the Apostles, must be regarded as the real starting-point of the mediaeval Papacy.*

In 447, Leo was again engaged in a conflict with heresy. Seventy years before the Priscillian heresy had arisen in Spain and in spite of numerous efforts to stamp it out, including the martyrdom of its author, it had continued to gain converts. The country had been overrun by the Suevi and authoritative action on the part of the church was impossible. A Spanish bishop, Turribius of Astorga, wrote a letter to the pope, laying the whole matter before him and seeking assistance and advice. Leo was delighted to have the opportunity to do something in the matter, and wrote to the bishop at length dealing with many points of the Priscillian heresy and expounding orthodox views. He concludes with directions "that a General Council of Spain should be summoned to deal with the whole matter, and mentions the four provinces of Tarragona, Cartagena, Lusitania, and Galicia, whose bishops are being advised of this plan. But Turribius is at the same time informed that, if the holding of a general council should for any reason prove impracticable, it would be well for him to assemble a provincial council from Galicia alone and to deal with the matter there." Leo's instructions were carried out in so far as possible. Two large councils were held and the Priscillian doctrines were condemned.

There are several other cases where Leo shows his power in settling disputes and asserting his authority throughout the West, but the ones given are sufficient to prove his purpose, activity, and success.

In the meantime conditions were such in the East as to force the attention of the Western church. The heresy of

Nestorius had been the subject of a heated controversy in the previous generation and had been condemned at the general council of Ephesus in 431. Cyril had been the inveterate opponent and bitter enemy of Nestorius. Of the friends and champions of Cyril none was more emphatic than Eutyches of Constantinople. (See Chapter XVII.) Eutyches wrote to Leo, in 448, regretting that Nestorianism had revived and was causing trouble. Leo replied to him, on June 1, applauding his zeal and orthodoxy. The next word which reached him from the East was that Eutyches had been condemned as a heretic by a Constantinopolitan council. From the decision of this council Eutyches appealed and was aided by Pulcheria, the sister of the emperor, Theodosius II. A council was assembled in Constantinople at which Eutyches was accused by Eusebius of Dorylaeum, as denying the two natures in Christ. Eutyches failed to appear upon summons. Summons was repeated the third time before he finally appeared accompanied by a mob of soldiers and monks. After a stormy and tumultuous debate, Eusobius finally forced Eutyches to the confession that "Christ was of two natures before the union, but after the union I acknowledge but one." He was immediately condemned and degraded from all priestly office, and thrust out of the communion of the church. Eutyches wrote to Leo, stating his case and asking aid. Flavian did the same, but the latter's letter never seemed to have reached Leo. The emperor also wrote to Leo. Finally word from Flavian reached the pope and he immediately made himself master of the evidence in the case. He sent a brief letter to Flavian telling him that he would later send a complete letter. In the following month he wrote the promised letter, one destined to literary immortality as one of the few letters which take a prominent place in history. It is known as the *Tome of Leo*. While addressed to an individual it really was written to the entire church, and is a solemn pronouncement upon the doctrinal question at issue. It seems to have been intended for formal presentation to the General Council. The chief bishop of the West undertook to put forth a statement of the true faith with respect to the grave matters in dispute, and this

met the hearty approval of the orthodox throughout the world. And this statement was generally accepted as an authoritative statement. And this was true, because the *Tome* stood firm by reason of its intrinsic value and not because of the position of the Bishop of Rome.

At the fourth session of the Council, the *Tome* of Leo was taken up for discussion and was finally accepted by the whole Council. This may well bring us to the close of the constructive work of this truly great man. "They were the critical acts of his sovereignty; and they have sketched, in vigorous outline, the pretensions of the Pontificate, which have been continually reasserted, in precisely the same direction and general terms, down to our day. Nothing on earth has been so consistent or persistent as this ecclesiastical policy of Rome. Whatever we may think about it now, it had its uses and necessities once; and we shall see them the more plainly as we get deeper into the shadow of barbarian times, and then into the twilight of Feudalism."

In the lives of Innocent I and Leo, we watch as it were the process by which that enormous fabric of ecclesiastical power was woven, thread by thread, till it seemed to wrap inseparably, like the membrane of a living body, every limb and interior organ of the great structure of mediaeval civilization. It is here that we see the process, but we see it imperfectly. "The unity of counsel in multiplicity of operations, which we call Catholicism,—apparently as strong to-day, in its own sphere, as a thousand years ago, and as able to send its servants to their post in hamlet or forest as then, as little afraid as then of sword or fire or torture or starvation, that great wonder of human history, the discipline of a vast population, like an army loyal to one flag and obedient to one word of command,—has been the task of many ages and many men. In the fifteen centuries of its existence it has produced enormous good and enormous evil. But it is justice to the name of Leo to say that the ideal good, without the inseparable evil, was what lay in his heart and made his strength; and to recognize him as the one man, in that day of terror and despair, who was wise enough and strong enough to do its necessary task."

## CHAPTER XXV

### MOHAMMED AND HIS TEACHINGS

**A**RABIA, from its position and physical conformation, was left practically free from the inroads of foreign arms. While other countries more accessible were overrun and made subject to foreigners, Arabia, throughout the centuries, maintained its independence. Situated between the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf, connected with Africa only by a narrow isthmus, and with Asia by a frontier most unfavorable for military operations, it was by nature protected from the envy and rapacity of the great nations which surrounded it. Then, too, it offered little to tempt the cupidity of its neighbors. For the most part it was a waste of sand and rock.

The country falls naturally into three divisions, a northern, a central, and a southern. The northern includes the area between the Midian coast on the west and the head of the Persian Gulf on the east, a desert tract throughout, stony in the north, sandy in the south, but furnishing at certain seasons of the year excellent pasturage. The population is nomad and pastoral. The central zone includes Hejaz, Nijd and El Hasa. Much of this region is a dry, stony or sandy steppe with few rivers or watering places, and only occupied by nomad tribes; but the great wadis which intercept it contain many fertile stretches of alluvial soil. These are cultivated quite extensively and support a large population with several large towns and numerous villages. The third or southern division contains the highland plateaus of Asia and Yemen in the west and Akhbar in the east. These have a temperate climate owing to their great elevation and their proximity to the sea. By reason of this and their general fertility, this portion of the country is known as Arabia Felix. The population is settled and agricultural, and the

soil, wherever the rainfall is sufficient, is productive. Coffee and dates are the chief products. The Batina coast of Oman, irrigated by the mountain streams of Akhbar, is the most fertile district in the peninsula; Hadramut too contains many large and prosperous villages, and the torrents from the Yemen highlands fertilize several oases in the Tehema or lowlands of the western and southern coast. These favorable conditions, however, do not reach far inland as the lack of rainfall brings the desert very near to the fertile fields of the west and east. A waste of sand and rock burning "like molten iron beneath a firmament of brass" and frequently engulfing caravans and even armies beneath its treacherous surface, and a wild nomad race which wandered to and fro over a pathless desert and vanished from view as an enemy appeared, offered little inducement to conquerors. Long streaks of scanty pasturage which gleamed upon the slopes of the mountains, running parallel to the two gulfs; the vine or palm, which here and there had been planted, by human labor, beside the wild tamarind and acacia, the only natural products of that arid land; these were not treasures to tempt the haughty king of Persia.

Arabia has an area of 1,200,000 square miles, sufficient to make thirty-six states the size of Indiana, or almost any of our western states save Texas.

The people inhabiting the Arabian peninsula were members of the great Semitic race, closely related to the Jews. Tradition has always represented them as a wild and rugged people. Ammianus Marcellinus, a rugged old Roman soldier, whose history has been praised by Gibbon and widely made use of, gives us a very graphic and authentic description of them as follows: "The Saracens, whose friendship and hostility were to us alike undesirable, rushing hither and thither, plundered in a moment whatever they could lay their hands on; just like a band of rapacious kites, who, when they catch a glimpse of their prey, swoop down upon it like lightning, and are off in a moment if they miss their mark. Among these tribes, which extend from Assyria to the cataracts of the Nile and the confines of the Blumnyae, all are alike warriors, and half naked, their only covering being a colored

cloak reaching to the loins. By the help of their swift horses, and camels of active frame, in peace and war alike, they scour the whole country, to its most opposite limits. No man among them ever puts his hand to the plough, plants a tree, or seeks a livelihood by cultivating the soil. They wander everlastinglly over regions lying far and wide apart, without a home, without fixed settlement or laws. The same clime never contents them long, nor are they ever satisfied with the occupation of a single district. Their life is one perpetual motion. Their wives they take on hire, and keep with them for a time fixed by previous arrangement; and as this is a sort of wedlock, the bride brings to her future master a spear and a tent with the privilege of leaving him after some specific day, should such be her pleasure. The licentious passion of both sexes is incredible. So wide are their wanderings, and so uninterrupted throughout their whole lives that a woman weds in one spot, gives birth to her child in another, and brings up her family far away from either, without ever being permitted to enjoy an opportunity for rest. All, without exception, live upon the flesh of wild animals; they have milk in abundance for their support, vegetables of all sorts, and such birds as they are enabled to capture by fouling. The majority of them we have seen to be entirely ignorant of the use of corn and wine. Thus much of this pernicious race of people."

This is a fair description of the race which furnished the material for Mohammed's great religious experiment. The national characteristics depicted above furnish some explanation of the marvellous success of the Mohammedan invasions. A certain fixedness of resolve, a strength of will which easily degenerates into stiff-necked stubbornness and obstinacy, united to a warm and brilliant, though limited imagination, seems to mark the Semitic mind. This power of fixed purpose united to an imaginative tendency has ever proved itself capable of engendering a religious exaltation which becomes a fervent and operative faith, in its most favorable development such as that of the Israelites, but which may easily break forth into terrible fanaticism when misdirected or debased. The qualities which characterized

the Jew throughout his entire history are as strongly marked in his kinsman, the Semitic Arab. "The same scorn of the stranger, the same indomitable zeal and national pride, the same headlong faith, which, regardless of human chances, stormed the strongholds of Phoenician giants and trampled on the necks of Canaanitish kings, were shown in after years, by the invincible zealots who scourged alike the Persian, the Greek, the Roman, the Visigoth, and the Frank, and shouted the watchword of the Prophet before the walls of Damascus, Constantinople, Alexandria, Toledo, and Tours."

The Arabians had an almost unbroken tradition of independence. This fostered their inherent obstinacy and pride, and gave them the spirit of self-confidence which is so great a factor in victory. The discipline of the desert life added to the hardihood and activity which enabled them to overcome obstacles that were insuperable to more organized armies.

But still other forces contributed their share to the same result and increased the energy of the original impulse by which these isolated bands of herdsmen and shepherds were massed and turned loose upon the outside world. The dangers of navigation upon the Red Sea made Arabia the great thoroughfare for the commerce of the ancient world. The treasures of India and Abyssinia were transported in Arabian caravans; the coin of Mesopotamia, the steel of Damascus, the pearls of the Persian Gulf, gems from the Indian mountains, the gums and aromatics of the seaboard of the Southern Ocean, daily passed before the eyes of these desert children. While this wild man sometimes aided in the labors of commerce, his heart was set on rapine and on war. Brilliant opportunities for plunder were open to him and he did not neglect them. Says the Roman writer, Pliny: "The innumerable tribes of this nation are equally divided between brigandage and trade." This national instinct became a powerful auxiliary to charms of ambition and territorial conquest. A race of robbers readily obeyed the call which summoned them to the plunder of the world.

But although this national characteristic doubtless had a great influence, yet we must look further for the dominating cause. This was the state of religion in Arabia and the

neighboring countries. It will occur to the thoughtful student of history that a revolution such as took place must have been preceded by a strange condition of belief and worship in the country where it so suddenly triumphed; and such was the fact. There lay back of the religion of the Arabs a belief in one god, but this had been overlaid with varied superstitions, and a grovelling idolatry, confused and contradictory without any of the grace and fancy of the Greeks, or the subtle symbolism of Egypt that had long been the worship of the Arabian peninsula. Three hundred and sixty idols of men or brute animals were ranged along the walls of the Caaba when Mohammed proclaimed, in that great national temple, the unity of God. Each of these idols no doubt represented a superstition prevailing in some particular tribe, and accepted with comprehensive indifference within the walls of the sacred edifice, which contained the black stone supposed to have fallen down from heaven. This was a black quadrangle block, worshipped for many centuries at Mecca and, according to tradition, the object of human sacrifice. But as these idolatrous cults were losing their power and authority, a further impulse was given to confusion by the contradictions and enmity of the four great religions which then existed in the world and which had by this time approached and entered Arabia from different quarters. Sabaism, the worship of the heavens, had lingered on in the East, even after the downfall of Babylon, and the persecution of the astronomers of Chaldea. The Persian Magi had in their turn succumbed to the Macedonian sword, and the professors of both these religions found their way to the freedom of the Arabian deserts. The Jews had always regarded Arabia as a kindred country. A remnant of these people escaped to Arabia when the Romans captured Jerusalem. These, with the fertility of their race, soon struck root in the new land, mingled in its commercial dealings, built synagogues in its cities, and undertook the conversion of the Arabs to the faith of Abraham. Christianity also appeared in this motley assembly of religions. It came in from Byzantine Greece, from Alexandria and from the Christian kingdom of Abyssinia. The latter kingdom had

attempted to establish Christianity in Arabia by force of arms. It had succeeded only to a very limited extent and had bred dislike and hatred among the fiery and patriotic inhabitants who looked upon all foreign faiths with suspicion. But Christianity was very far from presenting a formidable and imposing front. The internecine dissensions which had raged for so many years throughout Christendom had forced out many of the warring parties beyond the boundaries of the Roman Empire, where they continued their strife in a free field. "The Marcionites and Manicheans," says Gibbon, "dispersed their fantastic opinions and apocryphal gospels; the churches of Yemen, and the princes of Hira and Gossan were instructed in a purer creed, by the Jacobite and Nestorian bishops." It was indeed one of the darkest periods in the history of Christianity. Speculation and practice were alike corrupt, and the mingled evils of worldly ambition, false philosophy, sectarian violence and riotous living were well nigh victorious over the blood of martyrs and the wisdom and piety of great men. Here is a description of the Christian Church at the time when she should have arisen and done battle with the rival faith which was to shake the world. Dr. White, in Bampton Lectures for 1734, says: "If, in surveying the history of the sixth and seventh centuries, we call to our remembrance that purity of doctrine, that simplicity of manners, that spirit of meekness and universal benevolence, which marked the character of the Christian in the apostolic age, the dreadful reverse which we here behold can not but strike us with astonishment and horror. Divided into numberless parties on account of distinctions the most trifling and absurd: contending with each other from perverseness, and persecuting each other with rancor; corrupt in opinion and degenerate in practice, the Christians of this unhappy period seem to have retained little more than the name and external profession of their religion. Of a Christian church, scarce any vestige remained. The most profligate principles and absurd opinions were universally predominant; ignorance amidst the most favorable opportunities of knowledge, vice amidst the noblest encouragements to virtue; a pretended zeal for truth,

mixed with the wildest extravagance of errors; an implacable spirit of discord about opinions which none could settle; and a general and striking similarity in the commission of crimes, which it was the duty and interest of all to avoid."

At such a time as this when it would seem that the great religions of the world were failing to meet the demands made upon them for a spiritual uplifting power, Mohammed undertook the elevation of his people by the propagation of a new religion. He brought to the task a wonderfully perspicacious and subtle genius. He was, no doubt, actuated by a sincere conviction of the necessity for a great religious reformation among a people of a degraded life and contradictory creeds. The old idolatry, disturbed and partly enlightened by the admixture of other forms of belief, left an open door for the new religious appeal and this appeal found a most appropriate soil upon which to plant the seed of a new faith.

The religion which Mohammed introduced was successful from the first. It eliminated the old source of weakness, while, on the other hand, it assimilated to itself those principles in the rival religions which it found to be most vigorous, and carefully suited its teaching and requirements to the predominant instincts of the people to whom it was proclaimed. It swept away the old brutish idolatry; it seized upon the salient features of Judaism and Christianity, and left out what was repugnant to the natural tendencies of humanity. It cut short all difficulties either of speculation or practice by the bold declaration,—“*there is but one God and Mohammed is his prophet.*” This truth is asserted in a way well adapted to satisfy the aspirations of the natural intellect.

Thus Mohammedanism, to quote the words of Milman, “appeared before the world as a stern and austere monotheism, but it was a practical not a speculative monotheism. It had nothing abstract, indistinct, intellectual in its primary notion of the Godhead. Allah was no philosophic first cause regulating the universe by established laws while itself stood aloof in remote and unapproachable majesty. It was an ever-present, ever-working energy, still accomplishing its

own purposes." In the mind of Mohammed "nothing existed but the Creator and the Creation." "The Creator is undistinguished, undivided Unity, the Creation, which comprehended every being intermediate between God and man."

Mohammed was born in the year 570, thus associated in point of time with Gregory the Great who was born but a few years earlier. His father was of a family distinguished in the wars of his country, and had himself defended Mecca against the Abyssinians who were endeavoring to establish Christianity by conquest. But the future prophet lost both his parents in infancy and he was cared for by his grandfather and afterwards by his uncle, Abou-Taleb, who protected him as one of his own children throughout his youth, but was unable to do much for him. His education was like that of other Arab boys of fine parentage. He knew a horse as if he was its brother, and he was master of all the details of camp life, expert with the spear and the sword, and a lover of the deserts and steppes of his native land. He had a poetic temperament and was from childhood a mystic dreamer. Of philosophy and letters he knew nothing any more than did Joseph Smith, the founder of Mormonism. When but a youth of fifteen he became a camel-driver, an occupation which was looked upon with respect by his people but gave no promise of future wealth or distinction, but gave him an acquaintance with persons and places which exercised no small influence upon his intellect and future fortunes. While still a mere youth, by his faithfulness and skill in conducting the business enterprises of others, he commended himself to the attention of Khadijah, a wealthy widow of his kindred, who hired him to conduct her commercial affairs. With this charge he travelled to Syria and was so successful in the conduct of her business, in comparison with the work of her previous agents, that upon his return, the grateful widow, moved by his success in handling her business, as well as attracted to the young man by his manly beauty and pleasing personality, bestowed herself and all her wealth upon him in marriage. He no longer had to conduct in person the caravans of camels through the desert sands and protect them from robbers. He left this toil and danger to

others and henceforth spent a large portion of his time in meditation. Intensely religious by nature and temperament a mystic, he sought the silence and solitude of the desert and spent whole nights plunged in the profoundest reveries. The student is here reminded of the like experience of Saul of Tarsus: he too was a Semitic dreamer. Thus uneventfully he spent twelve years in contemplation and study, not of books, but of God. For the most part in the shadowy silence of a cave cut out from the rocks near his house, he wrought out his plan for the redemption of his people. To his faithful wife he declared his mission and designs. "I," said Khadijah, "*will be your first believer.*" And this is the best of all evidence of the sincerity and honesty of Mohammed. Said his freedman, Ali, his cousin, and Abou-Bekr, his most intimate friend, were the next converts, thus making a household of believers. To them he disclosed the revelations made to him by the angel Gabriel which he embodied in "the Book" (*Al-Koran*) and stated the doctrines it contained as "Islam," a word signifying complete abandonment to God. While Mohammed quickly won his family, the next step, to win his tribe, was not so easily taken. The vested interests of the Koreishite priesthood were against him and their enmity was something akin to that of the silver-smiths of Ephesus against Saul. He became for a time the object of hatred and a plot was formed against his life. Abou-Taleb warned him of the fact. But the Prophet was inspired with the true spirit of religious enthusiasm, if with nothing else. "Uncle," replied Mohammed, "if they could set the sun against me on my right hand, and the moon on my left, I would not abandon the affair." So Luther said at the gates of Worms: "If all the tiles on the house-tops were devils, I would not go back." But not only hatred but persecution became violent against him. Khadijah, his faithful wife, was dead; also Abou-Taleb. He was finally compelled to flee before the face of his enemies and take refuge in Yathreb, a city which had long been a rival of Mecca. This flight has become the famous *Hegira*, from which the Mohammedans date the commencement of their era, the 16th of July, A. D. 622. He was received in Yathreb with open

arms. This city is now known as Medina-tal-Nadi, or "City of the Prophet."

Mohammed's first care now became the destruction of the Koreishites. With but 313 men he fell upon a thousand of them at Bedar and scattered them in utter defeat. But the war continued with unmitigated fury and for a time with doubtful outcome. The Jews joined their forces to those of Mecca and together they administered a severe defeat upon the forces of Mohammed at Ohad and even besieged him in Medina. But he cut a deep trench about the city and by means of this succeeded in dispersing the enemy and making a truce for a period of ten years with Mecca. During this period he made many converts even within the walls of Mecca. Before the expiration of the ten-year truce, the people of Mecca violated it, and Mohammed immediately marched against the city with an army of ten thousand men. He made his way into the city almost without opposition. Seven times he rode his camel about the Caaba even as the Israelites went round the walls of Jericho, then entering this sacred temple he proclaimed with a loud voice, "Allah akbar" (God is great) and gave orders for the destruction of the three hundred and sixty idols which adorned its walls.

The ambition of his life was now fulfilled. He was the chief of a powerful nation and recognized as the Prophet of God. He stands supreme and alone. He has won the hearts of his people. He has made of Arabia a nation instead of a hundred warring tribes and petty kingdoms. "The old idolatry has sunk out of sight before the fear of his arms and the sublimity of his new creed." His successes were limited to the submission of all the Arab tribes, who voluntarily professed the new faith, or were exterminated by Khalid, the Sword of God. It seemed at one time that he would be compelled to pass the boundaries of Arabia and measure swords with the emperor, Heraclius. The Syrian Greeks had been conquered from Chosroes by Heraclius and added to the Byzantine empire. Some cause of quarrel had arisen which caused Mohammed to appear upon the scene with an army of 10,000 horsemen, 20,000 foot-soldiers, and 12,000 camels. The Prophet himself was at the head of this force

mounted on a camel and clad in robes of green. Upon his appearance Heraclius fell back with his whole army. Thereupon Mohammed returned to his own country, and, feeling the near approach of death, made a magnificent pilgrimage to Mecca at the head of 115,000 followers. He had scarcely returned to Medina when he died, on the eighth day of June, 632 A.D., the eleventh year of the Hegira, and the sixty-first of his age.

The teachings of Mohammed may be gathered from the Koran, the Bible of Islam. This book consists of the sayings and prophecies of Mohammed during his life and recorded by him upon bones and scraps of parchment in a haphazard sort of way but gathered with the greatest care and arranged by Othman, a son-in-law of Mohammed, and subsequently Khalif. In the rites and ceremonies of Islam there was nothing which required any violent breaking away from previous habits or religious observances. The Koran emphasizes four great precepts: (1) Prayer, (2) Almsgiving, (3) Fasting and (4) Pilgrimages. These are not new as all the religions of the world have made use of them.

Prayer is the universal language of all people and religions, but the direct and immediate agency of God in all human affairs and "His perpetual presence with man, insisted upon and enforced by the whole Mohammedan creed, as well as the concentration of all earthly worship on one single invisible God, has maintained a staid and earnest spirit of adoration throughout the Mohammedan world." The Old Testament bound the Jews to relieve the poor of his brethren with a generosity which has never been surpassed in the history of the world. The Greeks and the Romans were bound by ties of hospitality, and the barbarian Germans were specially praised by Caesar for their open-handed generosity to strangers. The Christian of the first and second centuries was prodigal of alms. The Arabs, before the time of Mohammed, had declared almsgiving to be the highest of religious virtues. The Koran puts its seal to this national trait and commands almsgiving as one of the great precepts of the faith. *Fasting* has always been a religious rite. It was prominent in Jewish religion. It was usual in the Greek

cults. The Ramadan is little more than the Christian Lent under another name. *Pilgrimages*, too, are old as a religious rite. Jews, in the time of Christ, were required to make a visit to the temple at least once a year. Christians had long since turned the grave of the Redeemer into a holy place to which pilgrims journeyed in constant streams: So the Koran turned the hearts of all true believers toward the Holy Cities, to Medina and Mecca, to which every faithful follower of the Prophet was expected to make a journey at least once in his lifetime.

In addition to the four principles given above, there are *six articles* embraced in the creed of the Koran. These are:

- (1) Confession of the unity of God; thus Mohammed rationalized the conception of the deity.
- (2) It acknowledged an intermediate world peopled by genii, an incorporeal race midway between angels and men.
- (3) Angelic appearances.
- (4) Prophets of God (Jesus being one of them).
- (5) The Resurrection and Day of Judgment.
- (6) God's predetermination of good and evil; this absolute with no exceptions.

The grandeur and simplicity of the concept of God formed by Mohammed is best seen in a speech he made to his followers: "There is a God living, and personal, no empty formula to play with, but a real father and Lord, who sits in the highest heavens, yet actually governs the kingdoms of the earth, not far from every one of us, ruling the nations with a mighty hand and an outstretched arm. He is your God, and you are His people, the champions of His cause, the chosen ministers of His will; go forth in His name to victory."

The death of Mohammed for a time imperilled the success of his undertaking as he had left no special directions either as to the form of government to be established after his death or the order of succession. A period of anarchy seemed to threaten. Both from relationship as from character and reputation, Ali, the cousin and son-in-law of the Prophet (husband of his daughter Fatima), was the fittest

of all the claimants for the glorious but difficult position of leader of the tribes of Islam. But through the influence of Ayesha, the favorite wife of Mohammed, her father, Abou-Bekr, was chosen, after a hot dispute between the citizens of Medina and Mecca. The new Khalif had all he could do for a time to maintain his position. But he was a man of wisdom and ability and soon proved himself a great military leader. He put down a formidable rebellion led by the false prophet Moseilama, and so soon as he felt himself secure upon the throne, he sent a summons to all the Arab tribes which ran as follows: "This is to acquaint you, that I intend to send the true believers into Syria, to take it out of the hands of the infidels. And I would have you to know that fighting for this is an act of obedience to God."

This was a cause that mightily appealed to the war-loving spirit of the Arabs and they responded with zeal. When his forces were assembled he gave them special directions as to their conduct. He said: "When you meet with your enemies, acquit yourselves like men, and do not turn your backs; and if you get the victory, kill no little children, nor old people, nor women; destroy no palm-trees, nor burn any fields of corn; cut down no fruit-trees, nor do any mischief to cattle, only such as you kill to eat. When you make any covenant or article, stand to it, and be as good as your word. As you go on, you will find some religious persons that live retired in monasteries, proposing to themselves to serve God that way; let them alone, and neither kill them nor destroy their monasteries. But you will also find another sort of people who belong to the synagogue of Satan, and have shaven crowns; be sure to cleave their skulls, and give them no quarter, till they either turn Mohammedans or pay tribute." This speech sets forth with great clearness the spirit and aims of the Saracen invasion. Like Gaeseric they are directed "against those whom God condemned."

The first exploit of the armies which were thus sent out to battle for the mastery of the world was the capture of Bostra, the key of the Syrian province. Heraclius, the emperor of the East, was an able prince and a born soldier. He had contended with some success against Persia and had

succeeded in re-conquering the provinces of Syria and Palestine which had been snatched from the empire in the previous reign. Heraclius sent an army of 70,000 men to aid Damascus which was invested by the Arab forces which had captured Bostra. But the troops of Heraclius were swept aside and destroyed by the fierce followers of Abou-Bekr. Before the lapse of three days, Khalid, the Sword of God and "Thunderbolt of War," had taken the city of Damascus and pushed on to the conquest of the East. The seven-day battle of Yermack opened the way to Palestine and practically accomplished the conquest of that country. Upon the day of the fall of Damascus Abou-Bekr died in the very midst of his victorious career, August 23rd, 634 A. D. His character may be judged by the fact that the whole inventory of his property amounted to five drachmas (\$1.22), which he ordered to be distributed among the people. "This," as Oman truly said, "was a hard pattern for his successors."

Omar, a second son-in-law of Mohammed, was chosen as successor to Abou-Bekr, and entered immediately upon a brilliant reign. To him belonged the glory of reducing Jerusalem. The city capitulated after a brief resistance, upon terms which became a pattern which was followed by Mohammedan princes for many years. These terms were protection to the persons of the inhabitants, and permission to retain the use of their churches. They were also allowed to keep possession of their property by paying tribute. Christianity was to withdraw from public gaze and conceal itself in its own sanctuary. No processions were henceforth allowed. All symbols of the Christian faith were to be removed; the cross upon the churches was to be taken down; bells were to be silent, and torches were to glitter no longer upon the streets. The use of Arabic (the holy language) was prohibited to all Christians, and the Koran was not to be taught to their children. Monasteries were left undisturbed but Mohammedans were to receive the same hospitality within their buildings which was offered to Christians. The monks were to receive the wayfaring Mussulman for three nights and give him food. The Christian population

was in every way degraded and made to feel their inferiority to their conquerors. They were distinguished in dress, in the manner of wearing the hair. They were denied the use of all arms, in this way forever condemned to the arts of peace.

The austere and ascetic Khalif made his appearance upon a camel. Before him, on his saddle, he carried a bag of dates and a leathern bottle of water. Of this frugal repast he himself partook, and offered a portion to the bystanders. Omar remained for ten days in Jerusalem. From here he marched to Aleppo and Antioch. These cities offered little or no resistance, and with their fall, Syria passed away from the Greek empire and was permanently lost to Christianity. So fell the patriarchate of Antioch and also that of Jerusalem.

Arab conquest swept on into Persia and the far East and overthrew the Parsee religion and planted Mohammedanism in its stead, but it is beyond the scope of this work to trace Arabian conquest beyond its struggle with Christianity.

While the tide of conquest thus receded to the East, an Arabian army under the command of Amru, one of the ablest of the Prophet's generals, turned westward and laid siege to the city of Alexandria. The Alexandrian forces were much divided by reason of sectarian quarrels among the Christians. The Monophysites, though numerous, had been ruthlessly persecuted by the orthodox Christians and, as a consequence, were exasperated to the point of rebellion. They gave but a half-hearted support to their religious enemies. After a siege of fourteen months the city capitulated to the forces of the Khalif. Alexandria was in many respects the second city of the world. So far as libraries and schools of philosophy were concerned, it was undoubtedly the first. It had a population of 200,000 and its wealth was very great. The empire put forth two attempts to retake the city. Their forces twice got possession of the bay and fortifications but were repulsed with great loss by the tenacious valor of the forces of Amru. During the tumultuous days of the siege and capture of the city, immense numbers of volumes, the most precious relics of antiquity, were con-

sumed as fuel or made away with for other purposes. Amru was blamed for this seeming wanton destruction of the world's literature, but this is not substantiated by any trustworthy authority, and his subsequent wise administration of the city's government and the regulation of the local imposts and taxation, and important public works undertaken under his auspices, prove him to have been a man very different from the ignorant barbarian which he is represented to have been by his Greek enemies. The conquest of Alexandria carried with it the subjugation of the greater part of the Greek seaboard of North Africa. This was followed in 648 by the fall of Tripoli, thus making the Saracens the masters of all of Roman Africa.

In another chapter (Chapter XXI) we have seen how Saracen armies, under their leader, Al-Tarik, crossed over the Straits of Gibraltar, in 711, and conquered the Spanish Peninsula, driving the remnant of the Visigoths into the mountains of Asturias and adding another empire to that of the followers of the Prophet. Mohammedan arms had now created an empire greater in extent than that of Rome. The Khalif had become the sovereign of Persia, Syria, Egypt, Arabia, Africa and nearly the whole of Spain, and that, too, in less than one hundred years. But this conquest and subjugation of powerful nations in such rapid succession is not so wonderful as the fact that the religion of the conqueror became that of the subject people. The Koran supplanted the sacred books of Zoroaster in Persia, and the formation of a new national language, the modern Persian from the admixture of the old native tongue with the Arabic, shows that the two races had become completely incorporated and the religion of ruler and ruled remained Mohammedan. So too the followers of Magianism seem to have become completely absorbed into the faith of Islam and lost sight of as a separate and distinct sect. But what seems even more remarkable is that Christianity in Northern Africa and Southern Spain, even in Alexandria, the home of Origen and Athanasius, and in Carthage and Hippo, the homes of Tertullian, Cyprian, and St. Augustine, utterly failed and died out and the Arabic language became not only the language

of the state but the people. That the Christian population which survived the sword in these countries became Mohammedian in belief there can be no doubt; the causes for such apostasy were many and mixed, but need not be discussed here.



**FOURTH PERIOD**

---

**FROM GREGORY THE GREAT TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE PAPAL AUTOCRACY**

**590–1250**

---

**BOOK VI**

**RELATION OF THE CHURCH TO CIVIL AUTHORITY**



## CHAPTER XXVI

### CHARLEMAGNE AND HIS INFLUENCE UPON CHRISTIAN CIVILIZATION

**I**N the Roman Empire legal rights came to be determined by the relation of citizens to the central administration, and so perfect was the machinery of the laws and so graded were the rights of the citizens, that the Roman Code has with scarcely a change been made the basis of the Code Napoleon, and used as the civil law of every nation in Europe. The German, on the other hand, had no gradation of legal rights. Each individual freeman claimed everything in earth and sea and air and recognized no rights of a neighbor. He had no property and, therefore, he had no need of laws governing property. The Carolingian period is to weld these two systems, so antithetical and strange, into a distinct and novel type of organization.

When Pippin, the first king of the Carolingian line, was anointed, his son Charles was ten years of age. He was thirteen when his father, at the instigation of Pope Stephen II, went against the Lombards and, after a glorious campaign, had his two sons made Patricians of Rome. This is all we know of the youth of Charles. The time in which he grew up was the last part of the darkest night in the history of literature. Until the middle of the seventh century, there were still to be found occasional evidences of erudition. There was still an attempt made to write history, and poets like Sidonius, Apollinaris, and Fortunatus lived among the Franks. But even these dull lights die away in the course of the seventh century. The Frankish conquerors, few in number, gradually amalgamated with the Romanized natives of Gaul; but although the language of the former became merged in that of the latter, their illiterate vigor seemed to have had more influence on the native population than the

semi-civilization of the natives had on the invading race. Schools became more and more scarce and were finally confined to the clergy; the art of writing almost perished. When Pippin the Short died in the full vigor of manhood, he undid the work of his lifetime, as his father, Charles Martel, had done before him, by dividing his realm according to the Salic law, between his two sons, Carloman the elder, and Charles, who was afterwards known in history as Charlemagne. The kingdom remained divided only three years (768-771), and these three years were consumed in the conquest and organization of Aquitania. Carloman seems to have furnished no help in this struggle and so fanned minor disputes between himself and brother into an open quarrel which lasted till the death of Carloman in 771, which event was brought about by a fever. The children of Carloman were despoiled of their inheritance by the Austrasian nobility who, no doubt instigated by him, made use of their power of election to place Charles on the Austrasian throne. Thus, as in the case of Charles Martel, a special providence discharges the duty of correcting the mistakes of men. By the death of Carloman unity is again established and government concentrated in the hands of Charles. Macaulay says that at the birth of Byron all the graces save one were present. All were present at the birth of Charlemagne. An Aryan nobleman was he. In him slumbered the strength of Hercules, the sagacity of Odysseus, the enterprise of Alexander, the eloquence of Demosthenes, and the interpid zeal of Luther. He was seven feet in height, with locks of molten gold, and eyes bright and blue and animated. When he appeared on the stage of history as the sole ruler of the kingdom of his father, he was but twenty-nine years old: master of four languages but unable to write: skilled in arms: endowed with the military glance, and a fine physique, worthy of the strength of his ancestral namesake, surnamed "the Hammer," and his sire who slew the bull and the lion; a fine horseman: a mighty hunter: the champion swimmer: in fine, a fiery, willful and imperious man, impatient of contradiction and opposition; of unruly passions; of a strong, clear intellect, allied to singular astuteness and unscrupulous violence.

— this latter trait in common with the age. His character, like the globe, alternates in light and shade. Unlike Henry VIII of England, the night side happily belongs to the earlier portion of his long reign.

The original and dominant characteristics of the hero of this reign, that which won for him and keeps for him after more than ten centuries the name of “Great,” is the striking variety of his ambition, his faculties and his deeds. Charlemagne aspired and attained to every kind of greatness; military greatness, political greatness, and intellectual greatness. Eginhard says of him, “In all his undertakings and enterprises, there was nothing he shrank from because of the toil and nothing he feared because of the danger.” He might err, as err he did; stoop to do wrong, as undoubtedly he stooped; be the slave of passion, as he was known to have been; but he had that within him which ever lifted him to a higher plane, to the sunny realm of virtue, piety, and justice. He was a successful conqueror, a sagacious ruler, a clear legislator, a good counsellor, an eloquent speaker, a munificent patron of literature, a far-sighted philanthropist, and a most princely benefactor of the church. And he united and displayed all these merits in a time of general and monotonous barbarism when, save in the church, the minds of men were dull and barren. To know him well and appreciate him justly, he must be examined under these various grand aspects, abroad and at home, in his wars and in his government. The Carolingian crown may be said to have been worn on the tenure of continual conquest. It was only on this condition that the family of Pippin of Heristal could vindicate the deposition of the Merwings and the supremacy of Austrasia, and each member of this house in turn gave an example of obedience to this law. It is Charlemagne, however, whose life has best fulfilled it. He spent forty-six years in military campaigns, without there intervening a single year of peace, and each was marked by some military triumph. In a campaign of six months he reduced the kingdom of Aquitania. In less than two years he drove the Lombard king into a monastic exile, placing on his own brows the iron crown and with it assuming the sovereignty

over nearly all the Italian peninsula (773–774). In thirty-three successive campaigns (772–803) he invaded the Saxon confederacy until the deluge of barbarism with which they threatened southern Europe was effectually and forever repressed. He swept over the whole surface of Europe, from the Ebro to the Oder, from Brittany to Hungary, from Denmark to Capua, with such a velocity of movement and such a decision of purpose, that no power, civilized or barbarous, ever provoked his resentment without sinking beneath his prompt and irresistible blows. It was owing to this almost superhuman activity on the part of Charles, more than to his pre-eminent proficiency in the science of war, that he ranks among the great commanders of the world. He reminds one of Gustavus Adolphus or Napoleon in his swiftness of movement, while in his ability to compensate for the numerical inferiority of his own forces to that of his antagonist, by converging his men upon some meditated point of attack in such a manner as to unite their forces at the same moment, he was superior to either of these and was equalled only by Hannibal. In this way only did he succeed in overthrowing the countless hordes of his assailants while he extended meantime the boundaries of the kingdom which he received from his father, Pippin. He added to the empire of Pippin, in the south, the whole of southern France except Provence, together with Catalonia and part of Navarre; in the north, modern Hanover, Brandenburg and Prussia to the Baltic and the Oder; in the east and northeast, Saxony, Silesia, and the Austro-Hungarian monarchy, together with nearly all Italy. If now we stop to examine into the causes which so constantly worked out the success of the conqueror and added so enormously to his dominions, we will find the following chief ones: — Every campaign was a national act. At Easter in every year he held a great council of war at which all the Austrasian, and many of the Neustrian bishops, counts, viscounts, barons, and leudes attended. Although the enterprise, mayhap, was planned and suggested by Charlemagne, yet it was adopted with the consent of all the bishops and nobles and was, therefore, carried out with confidence and enthusiasm. In all his wars, Gaul afforded to

Charles an invulnerable basis for his military operations. From Gaul he invaded every part of Europe, leaving behind him both an exhaustless magazine of men and arms and, in case of disaster, a sure retreat. He had made great improvement in the mere materials of war, by reason of his contact with Roman and Lombard subjects. His Franks were no longer a bare-legged and bareheaded horde, armed with the old barbaric lance and short sword, or defended by a round wicker-work shield. They now bore the long Roman buckler and visored helmet and were armed with the pileum, and with a long-pointed two-handed sword. He mounted his cavalry upon large powerful horses bred in the lower-Rhine country. With unerring geographical knowledge he was able, as I have previously said, to move his armies in separate corps and at the same time to strike the enemy with combined force in a vulnerable point. Charlemagne made war support itself. There does not occur anywhere in his laws any suggestion of military pay or tax for military purposes. War was at once the duty, the passion, and the emolument of his soldiers. The proprietor of land equipped, armed, and mounted his own followers; their living and pay they took from the enemy. He borrowed from Rome the example of making each new conquest the basis for a further strengthening of his military forces. He compelled the Lombards to march against the Saxons and Bavarians. In every nation which he subdued he, like Caesar, enlisted recruits for other campaigns and they received a just part of the glory attaching to further conquests. His unfailing maxim was to divide and conquer. In carrying out this policy he took advantage of differences in religion, language, or traditions; in public or domestic customs, or anything, in fact, which tended to promote or exasperate internal strife. The old Iberian, Gothic, and Italian populations regarded him as the antagonist of the dominant Saracen in the one peninsula, and of the dominant Lombard in the other, and from this substratum of society in each he received substantial aid. While Charlemagne was a memorable example of self-reliance in every field of activity, he ever showed the most generous confidence in the powers of his subordinate officers, and it

was through this union of powers that he was able to give the impression that he was everywhere present, even in an age when lack of travelling facilities made long journeys tedious and difficult in the extreme. Finally and chiefly, the establishment of his vast empire was due to the character he sustained as champion of the church. The elements of society were in discord, the church and the church alone maintained a unity of opinion, of sentiment, of habits, and of authority. It was to Charles the main pillar of State. All these causes appear clearly revealed in the events of the life of Charles, and they explain why it is that, as Gibbon says, "of all the heroes to whom the title of 'The Great' has been given, Charlemagne alone has retained it as a permanent addition to his name." It is this marvellous series of events which pass thus rapidly before our eyes that caused the contemporaries of the great conqueror and their descendants, even to remote generations, to cherish the traditions of his mighty deeds and to lavish on his memory every tribute which history could pay or the imagination of the poet weave.

We have traced the building of the mighty empire of Charles and looked into the causes which lay back of it. It now becomes necessary to examine into the government, the administration, and the laws of this vast empire which his matchless energy constructed. Before his accession, this vast territory had been little else than a hunting-ground and a battle-field for all the swarms of barbarians who tried to settle on the ruins of the Roman world they had invaded and broken to pieces. We have already seen that, by the wars that had resulted for him in permanent and well-secured conquests, he had put an end to disorder coming from without. We shall now see by what means he set about suppressing disorder from within; by what means he put his own rule in the place of the anarchy prevailing throughout the Roman world which lay in ruins, and throughout the barbarian world which was a prey to blind and ill-regulated force. Let me here say that Charlemagne was pre-eminently an *organizer* and not an *originator*, as Bryce claims. This must appear upon an examination of his acts of government, as it has

already appeared in his method of conquest, where he followed in the footsteps of his father. Charles Martel was nominal master of a great territory, but centralization had only gone so far with him as to make the conquered peoples tributary, and not parts of one great whole. Pippin but followed in the wake of his father and left even Burgundy separate but dependent. *Charlemagne built to this structure even more than he added to his territories.* In Italy he attempted to put himself at the head of the Roman civilization which he found breaking to pieces and which he labored to restore. In the Frankish territories and in their dependencies north of the Alps, he welded half-formed institutions into a strong government. As Charlemagne really played the parts of both king and pope, it will be necessary for us to divide his administration into two divisions; (1) civil administration, (2) ecclesiastical administration.

The civil administration is very naturally further divided, by reasons of the method he adopted, into *central administration* and *local administration*. The central administration was, aside from the personal action of Charlemagne and his counsellors, mainly carried on by means of assemblies or folk-moots of all the freemen, in accordance with a common Germanic custom. They probably had some crude method of representation as did the Saxons in their hundred courts. These great assemblies met twice a year, in March and May, or even oftener if specially summoned. Their chief purpose was to give advice concerning the framing of laws, the initiation of which had already been made by the emperor himself. Thus the definitive resolution depended upon Charlemagne alone, while the assembly merely furnished information and advice. He who carries his hero worship so far as to claim that Charlemagne was the establisher of a free constitutional government certainly goes beyond the truth. It is he himself who occupies the whole field; it is he who proposes and approves the laws or, in case of their initiative being taken by another man, rejects: with him rests the motive.

A careful study of the capitularies, enacted by Charlemagne in conjunction with the assembly, would reward us

well for our pains, but the space is too brief. The capitularies are the laws or legislative measures of the Frankish kings, Merovingian as well as Carolingian. The laws of the Merovingian kings, as might be supposed, are few in number and of slight importance, and among those of the Carolingian kings, which amount to 152, only 65 are due to the reign of Charlemagne. Among the 1151 articles contained in these 65 capitularies, may be counted: 87 of moral, 293 of political, 130 of penal, 110 of civil, 85 of religious, 305 of canonical, 73 of domestic, and 12 of incidental legislation.

If we compare the articles of penal legislation of Charlemagne with those of Alfred the Great some years later, we will find that, while only eleven percent of the former had to do with crime, fifty-seven percent of the latter was consumed in this way. This must be due to the influence of the church upon the civilization of the Franks. Charlemagne gave great attention to economic and administrative legislation. His economic laws would seem to have been copied after those of Valentinian III.

For purposes of local administration, the whole territory was divided into districts, afterwards called provinces, over which the power of the emperor was exercised by two classes of agents, appointed or nominated by Charlemagne himself. One of these classes was local and permanent, the other dispatched from the center and transitory. To the first class belonged *grafen*, or counts, *markgrafen*, or margraves, and *herzogen*, or dukes. A *graf* was a person who ruled over the smallest territorial division of the empire. If this division of territory chanced to be upon the border and was for this reason subject to inroads of barbarians, it was called a *mark*, and the ruler was called a *mark-graf*, or border-count. His office was both civil and military. The *mark* was but a military station, separated from the territory of the enemy by means of a wide strip of waste land, denuded alike of shelter and food. Within the center of the *mark* was the town or settlement where lived the tribe or military complement with their wives and families. Immediately outside of the town lay the farm lands of the community which were not originally held in private right but by the whole community in

common, and beyond these was the great *tun* or hedge fence for protection. As I said, this community was under military organization. Every able-bodied man was a militiaman under the command of the *markgraf*. The next unit above this, both of territory and of government, was the province, a name borrowed from the Latin *provincia*, and ruled over by a *herzog* or duke. This province was composed of several marks and its *herzog* ruled in behalf of the king. It was his duty to see to it that the *grafen* and *markgrafen* furnished their proper quota of troops to the imperial army, which troops would be marshalled under his own banner as corps-commander; he also, together with the *scabini* or sheriffs, saw to the rendering of justice, the maintenance of order, and the levying and receipt of taxes. In fact, his duties corresponded largely to those of the earl in old Saxon times who presided over the hundred court.

To the second, or transitory class, belonged the beneficiaries or vassals of the emperor, who held of him, sometimes in fee, more often still without fixed rules or stipulation, lands, domains throughout the extent of which they exercised somewhat in their own name and somewhat in the name of the emperor a certain jurisdiction and nearly all the rights of sovereignty. There was nothing very fixed or clear in the position of these beneficiaries or in the nature of their power; they were at one and the same time delegated and independent, owners and enjoyers of usufruct, the former or latter character prevailing among them according to circumstances. They were closely bound to Charlemagne, who generally charged them with the execution of his orders in the lands which they occupied.

Above all these agents which I have named, both local and transitory, magistrates and beneficiaries, were the *missi dominici*, usually three in number, two lay and one ecclesiastic, were bound not only to investigate the condition of the people and to try cases brought before them, but to make a careful report to the emperor concerning all things seen and noticed by them. These were, indeed, the chief instruments of unification and acted as the eyes and ears of the king and his *witan*. However, they did not act as a court

of last resort, for an appeal could be taken from them to the imperial tribunal, and finally to Charlemagne himself. The imperial tribunal was presided over by a palsgrave, an officer of the palace, who as justiciar presided in all cases in the place of the emperor.

While Charlemagne regarded himself as the civil ruler, his notion of his imperial functions extended to the sphere of religion and theology. He deemed himself a David rather than a Caesar Augustus, and with this idea he constantly interfered in the affairs of the church. "His all-comprehending, all-pervading, all-impelling administration was as equally and constantly felt by his ecclesiastical as by his civil subjects." The *missi dominici*, or royal commissioners, inspected the conduct, reported on the lives, fixed the duties, settled the tenure of property and obligations, determined and apportioned the revenues of the religious as well as the temporal hierarchy. Charlemagne legislated for priests as well as for laics, in each case with an absolute despotism. His institutes are in the language of command to all classes.

Before the death of Pippin he had succeeded in completing the ecclesiastical organization of the entire Kingdom and in a synod held at Vermeuil established the power vested in the clergy from the least to the greatest. As Charlemagne increased his empire by adding to the magnificent domain which he received from his father, so in the matter of religion he made use of the ecclesiastical organization already formed and merely extended and strengthened it. He divided his vast empire into twenty-one archbishoprics. Over each he appointed an archbishop (metropolitan), whose residence was in the chief city of his territory. In each city within an archbishopric he appointed a bishop, each bishop having a council of presbyters beneath him. The bishops of the several sees had exclusive control of all ecclesiastical affairs. Even monasteries, which had not been heretofore looked upon as in any way dependent, now were made subservient to episcopal jurisdiction, while the whole hierarchy was brought under imperial control, the emperor taking to himself the power of appointing all archbishops and bishops and compelling them to serve him for their lands.

The right of appeal lay from the bishop to the emperor rather than to the pope. In this way no matter by what gradation of steps you ascend, civil or ecclesiastic, it is Charlemagne who is discovered at the summit of the social pyramid. There were no servants of the church, from the least to the greatest, who were not supported either by tithes which were collected by imperial law, or gifts to the church made or sanctioned by Charlemagne. The whole clergy thus looked to him for their appointment and their living and he, in turn, while he fed them, legislated for them and in certain cases interfered with the doctrine they preached. He admonished them frequently to pure lives; forbade bishops, abbots and priests to keep hounds, falcons, hawks, or jugglers; forbade drunkenness, lewdness and swearing among the same class. He forced the clergy to diligent study, provided for preaching in the vernacular, and insisted that the laity know the pater-noster and the creed and understand the main Christian doctrines. He was an advanced thinker for his age. Listen to this: "Beware of venerating the names of martyrs falsely so-called, and the memory of dubious saints. Let none suppose that prayer cannot be made to God save in three tongues, for God is adored in all tongues and man is heard, if he do but ask for the things that are right."

In the first of his capitularies Charlemagne enacts the general rule: "We ordain that, according to the canons, every bishop shall give heed within his own charge, that the people of God do no pagan rites; but that they reject and put away all defilement of the Gentiles, profane sacrifices for the dead, or fortune tellers or diviners, or amulets, and charms, or incantations, or immolating of victims, which foolish people do near churches with pagan rites in the name of holy martyrs or confessions of the Lord; who invite their saints rather to wrath than to mercy. We advise that each year every bishop shall carefully visit his charge in circuit, and endeavor to confirm, instruct, and watch the people, and forbid pagan rites, diviners, fortune-tellers, auguries, amulets, incantations and all defilements of the Gentiles."

Thus we see that the rule of Charles included ecclesiastical

and secular affairs, and to the details of each he gave his most careful attention. The canons of the church have the same weight as the laws of the state, and the assemblies of the state were also synods of the church. "The heresies of Bishop Felix and the decisions of the Council of Constantinople in regard to image worship were condemned in the assembly that issued laws against political offenses and regulations for the order and administration of the State."

It will be remembered that since 476 there had been no emperor in the West, while the Emperor of the East had been unable to control that part of the great Roman State which had been builded by the valor and statesmanship of a long line of Caesars. But the West still regarded itself as a part of the one great empire. The coronation of Charlemagne in 800 is the famous transfer of the empire, which has brought about so much discussion and divergence of opinion. By the church, it has generally been held that the pope took the imperial crown from the emperors of the East and conferred it upon the king of the Franks. From the point of view of Frankish history, it has ever been considered as the culmination of the connection between the popes and the king of the Franks, begun with the coronation of Pippin. In the spring of the year 800, after having spent the winter in comparative quiet at his beloved Aachen, Charlemagne set out upon his fourth journey to Rome. He was accompanied on his march by his second son, Pippin, who had quite recently been crowned King of Italy. Arriving at Aneona, he sent Pippin with the army upon a ravaging expedition into the country of the Beneventans, while he himself continued his journey alone. On the 24th of November he arrived at Rome. On the preceding day he had been met by the pope, Leo III, at the little town of Mentana, fourteen miles northeast of the city. His Holiness partook of supper in the camp of the Franks and then hastened back in order that all things might be ready for the reception of his royal guest. Upon the morning of the 24th, the citizens of Rome, accompanied by ecclesiastics and guilds of foreigners, with flying banners and military standards, went forth from the city to greet their great patrician. Eager and

enthusiastic multitudes lined the avenue of approach and with joyful voices sang the customary lauds. The royal procession at last drew near to the venerable basilica of St. Peter where the pope, with the officers and clergy of the city, awaited the arrival of the king on the platform at the head of the magnificent marble staircase. Charles here dismounted and walked slowly up the steps of the basilica, where Leo received him. A prayer of thanksgiving was offered and amid songs of praise the king was conducted into the church.

After a week of rest and preparation for the tasks that awaited him, Charles, arrayed in the costume of a Roman patrician instead of the simple dress of a Frankish warrior, which was his custom, announced to the Synod, which had been summoned, the objects which had brought him to Rome. Of these the most important was the investigation of the crimes urged against Leo by his many enemies. Charles entered upon this task with his accustomed energy, but was met on the threshold by a difficulty unlooked for and insurmountable. For some reason unknown, no one was willing to come forward and formulate the charges against the pope. The chief instigators had doubtless been summoned to appear before the Synod and make formal charges, but nothing had come of it. The king doubtless discovered that there was no valid legal foundation for their charges, but they may have been cowed into silence. The truth will never be known. When the trial proved abortive, the pope purged himself of the crimes imputed to him by a solemn oath taken in the presence of the king, assembled ecclesiastics, and citizens. Fully three weeks now passed by without any act being recorded by the authorities. It can scarcely be doubted, however, that deliberations between Frankish nobles and Roman ecclesiastics took place, which prepared the way for the dramatic act that followed. Surely the Roman populace was not ignorant of the pope's purpose.

When the Christmas chimes awakened Rome on this memorable day, they fell upon the ears of a vast multitude eager to take part in the gladsome festival of the Nativity. While it was yet dark and the central nave of the basilica was

lighted by the soft glow of more than thirteen hundred waxen candles, through the wide portals of the church filed the bronzed veterans of the Frankish host and the body-guard of the king; the nobility of Rome, and the flower of the people, together with the most illustrious counts, generals, the court of the monarch, and the pontifical officers. Near the shrine of St. Peter, close to Leo, were Charles, King of Austrasia; Pippin, King of Italy; other members of the royal family, and, overtowering all the rest, Charlemagne himself in all the splendor of a Roman patrician. As the strains of mass died away, he knelt in prayer. As he arose from his knees, the pope approached him and, lifting high his hands, placed on the head of the giant king a golden crown, exclaiming, "To Charles Augustus, crowned of God, mighty and pacific Emperor, be life and victory." The expectant multitude took up the cry and repeated it again and again. Thereupon, all joined in a long series of choral invocations to Christ, to angels, to apostles, to martyrs, and to virgins, praying each separately to grant the newly crowned Emperor heavenly aid to conquer all his foes. In this way was the great revolution accomplished which had been preparing for more than three generations. An emperor again sat upon the throne of the Caesars, the first of a long line of Germanic Augusti who were to wear the imperial diadem until bidden by the first Napoleon, in 1806, to lay it aside as an out-worn symbol of a grandeur that had passed away.

The great emperor died in January, 814, and was buried at Aachen, his German home, where he had loved so well to live and whose basilica he had adorned with all the treasures of art. Here we find his tomb, under the dome, inscribed with these simple words, *CAROLO MAGNO.*

And now it is necessary to ask ourselves and attempt, at least, to answer the question, "How much of all this lived?" What was the effect which this truly great man produced upon civilization? Do the heroes of the world pass from the stage of activity and, as some historians have said, leave no trace behind? Charlemagne's system was a forcible repression of disintegrating tendencies which were all the time

gathering strength. Up to his time the frontiers of Germany, Spain, and Italy were in continual fluctuation; no constituted public force had attained a permanent shape. The history of the civilization of France under the Merwing kings presents a constant universal decline. In religious society as well as in civil society, everywhere we have seen anarchy and weakness extending themselves more and more; we have seen everything become enervated and dissolved, both institutions and ideas; what remained of the Roman world, and what the German had introduced. "Up to the eighth century nothing of what had formally been could continue to exist; nothing which seemed to dawn could succeed in fixing itself." Charlemagne changes all this. He arrests decay and reinstates a course of progress. He marks the place at which the dissolution of the Roman world is consummated and where the foundation of modern European states begins. Destruction ceases and creation and growth renew themselves.

The secret of his failure to establish a permanent government — for he did fail — is in the fact that not centralization but localization was the will of the people. At the time in which Charlemagne lived centralization could only be obtained in the hands of a great man. Could a succession of Charlemagnes have been obtained, then the great object of this great man could have been reached and the civilization of Europe might have possibly been advanced five centuries. I say possibly, because I am not sure but the slow process through which the present civilization has been produced was the only way. The tree which weathers a century of storm is the tree which has required a century of growth. The great aim and glory of the life of Charlemagne had been the revival of the empire of Rome and to put new life into the dead body of imperialism. He failed in this attempt and all the machinery of centralization failed with him. And the reason was that the people were not ready for it yet. Says Bryce, "The nations were not ripe for settled life or extensive schemes of polity; the differences of race, language, manners; overvast and thinly populated lands baffled every attempt to maintain their connection; and when once the

spell of the great mind was withdrawn, the mutually repellent forces began to work and the mass dissolved into that chaos out of which it had been formed. Nevertheless the parts separated not as they met, but having all of them undergone influences which continued to act when political connections had ceased." This is true in a measure. Charlemagne's central government failed, if not during, yet immediately upon the close of his life; but the local government, the *grafen*, *markgrafen*, *herzogen*, with the beneficiaries and vassals who held authority in their several neighborhoods, still lived. Property in land, which had been either unknown or very unstable during previous reigns, in the forty-six years of the government of Charlemagne became established, and this, as is always the case, brought with it the elements of stability, order, and progress. About the *graf*, the *herzog*, and the bishop, each with the land over which he had been made master, there grew up a host of dependent vassals holding lands and looking to these persons for redress of grievances. From these centers were to grow up within succeeding generations the next order of society, the only society possible, cut, so to speak, to the measure of existing ideas and relations; both ecclesiastical and civil institutions are destined to receive from this source an impulse which is to be the condition of subsequent progress, and again and yet again is the civilization of our day to be affected by the handiwork of Carl.

## CHAPTER XXVII

### FEUDALISM AND THE CHURCH

IN the chapter upon Charlemagne we stated that he unintentionally developed feudalism while striving to rebuild the Roman method of government. You will probably recollect that in our consideration of the state of Roman Gaul and its inhabitants, both ancient and modern, after the barbaric invasions, we at least attempted to establish the fact that the two primitive associations of the Germanic nations, the tribes and the warrior bands with their respective methods of administration and military patronage, were broken up in passing to the Roman soil, for their institutions no longer suited the new situation in which they as conquerors found themselves. After the invasion into the empire an immense amount of territory was thrown open to the eager avidity of the conquerors. They dispersed themselves throughout it in every direction. The chiefs seized upon vast domains upon which they settled their followers, while the ordinary freemen at first mayhap contented themselves with common holdings. They were too far apart to meet often and deliberate in common. In this way the political sovereignty of the old general assembly, or folk-moot, became impracticable, was doomed to perish and give way to another system. We have also seen the Roman society, its general organization at least as to the force that presided over it, the imperial administration, dissolve after the invasions so that at the commencement of the eighth century, Roman society and Germanic society had alike perished in Frankish Gaul, now abandoned to the most heterogeneous anarchy. Again, we have seen how Charlemagne failed in his attempt to resuscitate and restore the empire by re-establishing on the one hand the Roman administration; on the other, national Germanic assemblies and military patron-

age, which latter was patterned upon the independent military band or *gefolge*. He in some sort renewed all the modes of association, all the means of government which the empire and Germany had known, and which lay disorganized and powerless about him. He reminds one of an architect attempting to build a palace out of the broken and disorganized fragments of a Roman cathedral and the mud hut of a German. Between these parts there is no cohesion. He piles them together without much regard to form and beauty. A mosaic from the wall of the cathedral is in juxtaposition with pieces of wasp-board clay. Carl succeeded for a moment, and on his own account, but this was merely, as Guizot says, a galvanic resurrection. As applied to a great society, the principles of the imperial administration, those of the wandering band, and those of the free tribes of Germany were equally impracticable. The spirit of Roman imperialism failed to make any allowance to the rights of the individual man; that of the Germanic assemblies failed to control this individual in his assumption of absolute freedom from all social restraint; and being at best but a cumbersome machine but poorly adapted to the conditions of the new settled life, it fell to pieces. So, when the iron hand of Carl was crumbled in the grasp of death, society made haste to resolve itself into its component atoms. The element of cohesion being removed, our architect's palace fell again into fragments of cathedral and mud hut. Please keep in mind, however, that these atoms of two contending civilizations, these fragments of the artistic and the common, had all been polarized and when they were left free to seek their own affinities they gradually arranged themselves in a *new and unique feudal pattern*. Iron filings having once come in contact with a magnet, or current of electricity, are left forever changed. The causes for the dissolution which took place after the death of Carl have already been discussed and it will not be necessary for us to tarry here for a reconsideration of the question. That which now demands our attention is the life principle, the electric current, which has polarized these atoms of statehood and caused them to rearrange themselves after a new pattern. It may well be

named property in land. The phenomenon which we are to study simply marks a general process of land feudalization characterizing a certain grade in the political and economic growth of all the Aryan peoples. The universal primitive form of all land ownership was the collective. The invasions found the Germanic village communities where those of India are today, just emerging from this. Under these conditions no great society could be maintained. Mankind had few ideas, in those days, and the horizon of thought and of life was exceedingly limited. Without thought a great society is impossible. Such was the condition in the times of which we now speak. When by conquest the Germanic tribes became possessed of a vast extent of territory and the members of these tribes saw about them on every side properties held by individuals who reaped the fruits of the fields without having, as was the case with themselves, an assembly of wise men to divide them proportionately among the neighbors, we can readily see how such a system would find favor in their eyes. And the cry did arise, on every side, "Give us too of these lands that we may sow and reap and garner for ourselves." Such a cry would naturally come first of all from the warrior chieftains who by their services had so commended themselves to their king or leader that they could ask a favor from him. In response to this the king granted large tracts of land to such chieftains as benefices or gifts, and these chieftains, in turn, granted portions to their immediate followers, or *gefolge*, upon the same terms. As we have already taken occasion to say, these benefices were at first held by an uncertain tenure, some at the pleasure of the king, others for life, others still for a definite term of years. But as is always the case, the tendency of these gifts was to perpetuate themselves in the hands of the descendants of the original holders and we shortly find laws enacted recognizing the principle of heredity and granting to the descendants of holders of benefices the same privileges and immunities which their fathers had enjoyed before them. Thus we find property in land established by the time of Pippin the Short. This property was probably subject to some form of taxation such as gifts to the king or lord from

whom the benefice was received, but no regular form of taxation was resorted to and certainly the right in the land was equivalent to a *fee simple*. We have already stated that thought was slow in this age. Ideas were scarce; but it does not take a great amount of brain energy for a man to grasp the idea of ownership. "This is mine" is the first product of brain activity in a child, and the barbarian child has at last learned this lesson, and for the Germanic race has been established a new center of civilization. The only form of society possible, the only form of government possible, clustered around these new centers and cut themselves, so to speak, to the measure of existing ideas and relations. The elements of these petty societies and petty local governments were ready made at hand. The possessor of benefices by grant from the king, or domains occupied by conquest; the counts, dukes, governors of provinces, and bishops, which were established by Charlemagne, were all disseminated throughout the country, and all held large tracts of land over which they were supreme. Round these was agglomerated, voluntarily, or by force, the neighboring population, whether free or in bondage. All became local, because all generality was vanished from interests, existences, and minds. The whole Germanic race was occupied but with one idea and, in fact, had no room for more: private property. A very large proportion of the members of this race are still living within this stage of development, and are still giving their time and energy simply to the transfer of property from others to themselves. Thus were formed the petty states called fiefs. It was about the end of the twelfth century, and when the last of the Carolingian race was on the throne, that this revolution may be said to have been consummated, and the new order of things fully established.

The principle of imperialism is the last word of the expiring past. That principle secured a certain equality for mankind, the servitude of *all* under the domination of *one*. Society could not accept this as its fundamental organic principle. The opposing principle of individualism, which was alike rejected, in destroying absolutism, introduced anarchy. It is but fair to say that feudalism did not create,

but regulated, this anarchy. The feudal system does not, therefore, present the phenomena of social decay but rather of social progress. It has been very generally misunderstood.

It is now our purpose to consider feudalism in its component elements. Upon examination we will always discover present in this historical feudal system two elements very closely united, but which are really distinct, and which must be kept apart from each other in mind if we are to understand the origin of the system. One of these elements relates wholly to land and the tenure by which land is held. This land element is the "benefice," or "fief." This is the "feudal molecule," or simplest element of feudalism. It is that which could not be broken without the feudal character being abolished; the domain, possessed by way of fief, by a lord who exercised over the inhabitants that sovereignty which is inherent in property. The other principle is the personal relation, the bond of mutual fidelity and protection which binds together these several grades in the feudal hierarchy. This personal element is the relation of *lord* and *vassal*.

There are several institutions which sprang into existence during the later Roman Empire which are worthy of our consideration, as they furnish us the beginnings of certain feudal principles. Roman agriculturalists, by reason of the inroads of barbarians, had become accustomed to give up their land to some powerful lord who could grant them the necessary protection, and to receive at least a portion of it back to be cultivated by them as *tenants-at-will*. Such a holding was without any rent or obligations whatever, and was known by the legal title of *precarium*. The holder of a *precarium* was called a client, and the institution itself, *patrocinium*. This plan of seeking the protection of some powerful local lord who could furnish that security and peace which the empire was no longer able to do, had become quite common, especially throughout the northern part of Italy and Dalmatia. Many poor free men who had lost their property and so were without any land through which they could secure protection above, went to

a lord and begged his protection, claiming they were no longer able to protect and care for themselves. The lord, who was generally ambitious to increase his dignity and standing in the community by having as large a body of dependents as possible, granted to these petitioners their request and enrolled them in his household, asking in return such services only as were not beneath the dignity of a free man to perform. It is to be noted that these obligations were not definite. The free man received no land and swore no oath of fidelity. "The personal relation or clientage did not imply at all the reception of land, and holding land by the *precarium* tenure involved no obligation of services."

The Franks, as well as other Germanic peoples, had institutions very similar to the Roman ones which we have just described. Of these the most important was the *comitatus*, or *gefolge*. "This was a purely personal relationship of mutual protection, service, and support between a chief and certain men . . . voluntarily entered into on both sides." It was looked upon as conferring honor upon the lord as well as upon the man, and was entered into on both sides by a special ceremonial, and sanctioned by a solemn oath, and the bond of personal fidelity established by it was considered to be of the most sacred and binding character. No grant of land accompanied this, however, and when the Franks settled in Gaul and scattered over a wide extent of territory, it was no longer possible to perform the duties of this relation, the bond of the *gefolge* being broken by this, and its spirit lost.

The dominant Roman institution, the *patrocinium*, lived on, being attached to the soil, while the *comitatus* died, at least in so far as its form was concerned. The explanation of this is simple. It will be seen that the Roman practices in this respect would appear perfectly familiar to the conquering Frank, and as they settled upon the land and became attached to the soil, the *gefolge* being broken up and scattered, they passed naturally over to the Roman method of binding to them by sub grants of land, a new body of dependents. Nevertheless the Roman *patrocinium* was essentially modified by the Germanic usages. The personal ele-

ment was carried over from the *gefolge* to the *patrocinium* and furnished a new bond or contract between the lord and the tenant. By it the tenant was secure of his holding while the lord was assured of the personal services upon which the holding was made to depend. The word vassal is derived from the post-classical Latin word *va*, a cow, and is, therefore, precisely identical with the word *feudal*, or *feodales*, which comes from the German word *fe*, or *vieh*, a cow. The word *vassus* was first used as the title of an unfree servant, in the later Roman usage; thence it was carried over to the *free client* of the *patrocinium* and thus became a distinctly honorable title. It will thus be seen that in the early development of feudalism a vassal stood one step above an ordinary freeman. As already stated, it has been conclusively shown that German kings, or failing kings, tribal chiefs, following native Germanic ideas, made donations of land with limited tenure, so that the land fell back, under certain conditions, to the donor. From this method to that of the Roman *precarium*, the transition was an easy one, and it would appear that this Roman device was used extensively by German private land owners who found themselves in a situation similar to that of the Roman agriculturalists. By the time of the Carolingians it was adopted as the chief means of sub-infeudation. In this carrying-over process of a Roman institution into German usage, the church was the most important factor and made frequent use of the *precarium* with a small rental attached. Numerous charters of this kind of grant are extant bearing dates antedating the reign of Charles Martel. Throughout the entire Merovingian period and even to the time of Charlemagne, these institutions remained in much the same shape in which they were in under the empire. One change only is noticeable, and that is a very important one. They were legalized. The Roman looked upon the whole scheme of the *precarium* as a usurpation which he vainly tried to crush. The Franks saw within it an institution of their own but slightly modified to suit their new environment, and immediately recognized its legality. Frankish kings frequently made use of it with their subjects, thus holding them in closer bonds of fealty.

Originally neither of these primitive Roman institutions had any military character attached to them, and this statement is equally true of the Merovingian period. Of course it would come to pass in such a troublous time as that in which these institutions were brought into being, that the most frequent services needed from the dependent would be military, and some of them at least were constantly employed as men-at-arms. But there was during the early period no necessary connection between military service and the holding of lands, or the personal relationship. If these existed they existed upon a separate basis. The occasion which led to the beginning of this change was the attack of the Arabs on Gaul and the necessity of forming a cavalry force to withstand this. The Franks to this time always fought on foot, as did the other Germanic tribes, but when Abderrahman appeared, in 732, with his host of cavalry men, and attempted the conquest of Gaul, Charles Martel was convinced that the only way to defeat him was by organizing a cavalry force as an aid to his infantry. How was he to do this? The citizen was already oppressed by the service he was rendering, having to support himself and furnish his own arms. On top of all this he could not be asked to furnish a horse. The time had arrived when the state must come to the aid of the citizen and bear at least a portion of the expense of protection. This could only be done by grants of land, as a system of equitable taxation was wholly unknown to the Frank and, indeed, did not develop until much later. But the royal domains had been exhausted by the shiftless Merovingian kings. There remained, therefore, only one way open and this Charles did not hesitate to follow. The church had landed possessions to the extent of nearly one-third of the entire territory. It had been the custom for some time for the state to assume the use of small portions of this land, in scattered tracts. Charles, taking this custom as a precedent, now confiscated a large portion of the ecclesiastical territory, though he recognized the ownership of the church by laying upon the lands the payment of a small fee. The church has repaid for this high-handed, but necessary act, by black-listing him and

giving him a sorry name in the annals of his time. The monks who wrote his history have taken great delight in painting the agonies of his death bed, and for some centuries, imitating the punishment of Sisyphus, had his bent and blackened spirit rolling stones up the glowing sides of the crater of Vesuvius. The land which Charles secured in this way, he granted to vassals of his own on condition that they furnish mounted soldiers to the army. This created a sort of new body, called tenants-in-chief, who divided the lands thus received, among their own followers, in the same way. For this purpose the old Roman *precarium* furnished a convenient tenure, and the records of the church show that these lands were generally known by the name of *precaria verbo regis*; that is, lands held by the word of the king. The name given to these lands by the common people, resting no doubt upon the action of the king, was *beneficium*, our word benefice, a gift made with certain restrictions. This is the beginning of the institution of knighthood and indicates the way in which the first steps were taken toward introducing the special obligation of military service as a condition on which land was to be held. This process, however, extended throughout the Carolingian period and can not be said to have been completed before the reign of Charles the Simple.

Charlemagne attempted to reorganize the military system or, at least, to enforce the laws then in vogue. His own vast military expeditions over such great distances and involving constant service, taxed to the utmost the poorer citizens, who, according to universal German custom, had to arm and support themselves. They tried to escape from this service in every way possible. Charlemagne first enacted that several of these free men should unite in arming and supporting one of their number, this one to render continual service. He also directed that the vassals of private individuals should perform military service in the same manner as did the vassals of the king. Next, he enacted that the lord should be held responsible for the equipment and appearance of his vassals at the appointed time, or pay a fine for their failure. Under this plan they were all

marshalled under officers appointed by Charlemagne, and organized after the pattern of the Romans. All these regulations seemed to have little or no effect and the difficulty of obtaining men increased. Some further change had to be made or the army fall off in strength. As a last resort Charlemagne ordained that the vassals should hereafter come into the field under the command of their own lords instead of being absorbed into the general levy. Whether anticipated or not, this plan appealed to a weakness of human nature. The natural desire of every lord to appear under the eyes of his king with a body of vassals at least equal to any other lord accomplished what law could not accomplish, and henceforth there was no scarcity of men. But the result of all this was to make the army almost entirely a feudal army, the state henceforth depending not upon citizens, as of old, but upon vassals who served as a duty growing out of their holding of land. In this way it came to pass that perhaps the most important duty of citizenship, that of defending the state, was transformed from a public obligation, which rested upon every free man, into a matter of private contract, and, so, became one of the ordinary conditions incident upon land holding.

While the transformations in method of land holding and military service described above were taking place, another change no less important was being brought about in regard to legal jurisdiction. The process by which this transformation was accomplished can not be traced with the same clearness and exactness as in the case of the military, above. It is certain, however, that judicial functions passed over from the state into the hands of private individuals and became, like the military duty, attached to the soil. "In this way the great fiefs came to possess what the French feudal law called 'justice'—*jurisdictio*—that is, full sovereignty, so that the state was practically excluded from all contact with any persons residing within the limits of the field." We have previously stated that the process of this change was not fully known. It is certain, however, that it was aided by the "immunities." These were grants of privilege to churches or to private individuals, by virtue

of which the ordinary officers of the state were forbidden all entry upon the specified domain, and the owner took the place of the regular officers of the state. He was not made independent of the state, but only of the state's officers; but it must be considered a long step toward the development of private jurisdiction and virtual independence. In some cases this will account for the sovereignty of the fief. Others there were who, no doubt, purchased the right of levying and collecting their own taxes (*ferm*) and adjudicating their own cases, both civil and criminal, as was the case with many English boroughs. Add to these the ever present element of usurpation and we have a likely theory at least for the establishment of feudal judicial independence which became almost universal by the time of Louis IX of France. The courts thus established, or controlled, retained their fundamental principles unchanged. The vassals now came together as did formerly the citizens (free men) in the old courts of the village community or the hundreds. They still pronounced judgment in all cases brought before them, enacted the local laws, and interpreted or stated the local custom.

While the changes mentioned above were taking place the great public offices of state were becoming hereditary and, consequently, localized.

The geographical extent of territory depended upon circumstances. The most decisive of these circumstances was the personal ability of the successive generations of lords, their success in preserving some considerable show of order and security, and making their government respected and feared over a larger or smaller extent of territory, and especially their prowess in compelling outlying holders of land of less strength to recognize their supremacy. If they were powerful men and at the same time good organizers, then their lands continually increased until they reached the boundaries of some other lord as powerful as themselves. If they were weak men, then they were taken advantage of both by their rivals who overran and pillaged them, and by their vassals who never hesitated to declare their own independence whenever opportunity presented itself. Fiefs grew on

the one hand by absorbing small allodial holdings and turning them into "benefices," while, on the other hand, they shrank up by vassals succeeding in making their benefices free. Both the number and size of fiefs varied continually, until, by the growth of royal power, they were gradually absorbed into the central state. It may be well to state that the various titles of nobility gave no accurate idea of the size of the holding. It very frequently happened that the territory of a viscount was greater than that of a count and even embraced the latter within its borders. An ordinary lord oftentimes surpassed a duke in the extent of his holdings.

"In general, from the tenth to the beginning at least of the thirteenth century, the political aspect of western Europe was thoroughly feudal, and even in those parts of the country where allodial lands largely predominated, as for example in central France, the state was as weak as elsewhere, and the local government as completely local."

We have now traced as completely as space allows the origin and development of the feudal system. The insignificant Roman institutions which had sprung out of local and transient needs, vitalized with the personal element of the old *comitatus*, have developed into a political organization extending over the whole of Europe and virtually supplanting the national government. The need of security and protection had produced this change. Men had taken to the castle because the power of the state had been broken so that it was no longer able to grant personal security. There was an almost total absence of all the elements which go to make a stable government and the reason for this lack is found in the condition of society. The Germans, when they succeeded to the empire, had taken upon themselves a task too difficult for them to perform. This is only another way of stating the fact that the Germanic invasions were followed by a temporary decline in civilization. This was true in political order just as well as in literature and science.

We have so far had some idea of the condition of things in the completely feudalized state, and of the character of

feudalism as a political organization. The perfected form which the lawyers finally gave to the feudal theory as a matter of land law and of social rank is undoubtedly the source of the popular idea that the feudal system was a much more definitely arranged and systematized organization than it ever was in practice. With us, doubtless, the *Commentaries* of Blackstone are probably, more than any other single source, responsible for this impression, as they are for other ideas of history which are not by any means correct. Blackstone says, speaking of the introduction of feudalism as a result of the Norman conquest: "This new polity therefore seems not to have been imposed by the conqueror, but nationally and freely adopted by the general assembly of the whole nation, in the same manner as other nations of Europe had before adopted it, upon the same principle of self-security, and, in particular, they had the recent example of the French nation before their eyes, which had gradually surrendered up all its allodial or free lands into the king's hands, who restored them to the owners as a *bene-  
ficium* or *feud*, to be held by them and such of their heirs as they previously nominated to the king, and thus by degrees all the allodial estates in France were converted into feuds, and the free-men became vassals of the crown. The only difference between this change of tenure in France and that in England was, that the former was effected gradually, by the consent of private persons; the latter was done all at once, all over England, by the common consent of the nation."

Of course no such facts as these ever occurred either in France or England. The lawyers, however, did form such a theory as this of the feudal state and it is but natural that the popular notion should be something like this:

(a) The ownership of all the soil of the kingdom is vested in the king.

(b) The extent of this territory is so great that he cannot cultivate it all himself, while on the other hand, he is involved in great expenses as the head of the state, for protection and the administering of public functions, the building of roads, and the enforcing of laws. To obtain needed

funds and forces, he parcels out the entire kingdom into a certain number of large divisions, each of which he grants to a single man, who gives a binding promise to assume a certain specified portion of these public obligations in return for the land which is granted him. So long as he fulfills these duties he continues to hold these lands, and his heirs after him have the same privileges so long as they perform the required obligations. In case he fails or refuses to perform the obligations, the king may resume his lands and grant them to some more faithful vassal.

(c) These great barons, created in the above manner by the king, divided their lands among their vassals whose united services enable them to meet their obligations to the king. "These vassals subdivided again, by like process of "sub-infeudation" and so on down to the knight's fee, or lowest subdivision of the feudal system, a piece of land large enough to support and arm a single warrior of noble condition."

This, in brief, is the story of the lawyers and the idea of feudalism which generally prevails. It has a general correspondence to the actual facts which prevailed from the beginning of the tenth century. As we have seen, public duties were transformed, in a large measure, into private services which were rewarded by grants of land, and the state did depend upon the land-owners for protection and sustenance. But no one of these tendencies was completely realized in the actual feudalism of any country of Europe. The pattern was far less regular than this theory would indicate and the law of feudalism, instead of being uniform in minor details, was simply and purely customary law formed by each locality for itself to suit its own needs. Thus it would seem that the feudal system was "confusion roughly organized."

With this preliminary discussion we may with approximate exactness define Feudalism as follows: "Feudalism is a form of political organization which allows the state to separate into as minute fragments as it will, virtually independent of one another and of the state, without the total destruction of its own life with which such an experience would seem to threaten every general government."

It now seems necessary, after tracing the origin of the feudal institution and reaching a general concept and definition, to enter into the central life of the institution, the *feud*, and see if we can understand its spirit. When reduced to its last analysis the simple fief contains two elements: (a) The castle with its occupant, the proprietor of the fief; and (b) the village, containing the possessors, or cultivators of the domain, who are subject to the proprietor. It is very necessary for us to know what was the condition and the destiny from the eleventh to the fourteenth century, of these two elements, the castle with its proprietor, and the village with its inhabitants.

(a) I can do no better than to borrow a description of a castle from the celebrated work of M. Manteil, as quoted by Guizot. "First imagine to yourself a superb position, a steep mountain, bristling with rocks, furrowed with ravines, and precipices. Upon the declivity is the castle. The small houses which surround it set off its grandeur; the Indre seems to turn aside with respect; it forms a large semi-circle at its feet. This castle must be seen when, at sunrise, the outward galleries glimmer with the armor of the sentinels, and the towers are shown all brilliant with their large new gratings. Those high buildings must be seen, which fill those who defend them with courage, and with fear those who should be tempted to attack them."

"The door presents itself all covered with heads of boars or wolves, flanked with turrets and covered with a high guard house. Enter; there are three enclosures, three moats, three drawbridges to pass. You find yourself in a large square court, where are cisterns, and on the right and left, the stables, hen-house, pigeon-houses, coach-houses; the cellars, vaults, and prisons are below; above these are the magazine, larders, or salting-rooms, and arsenals. All the roofs are bordered with machicolations, parapets, guard-walks, and sentry-boxes. In the middle of the court is the donjon, which contains the archives and the treasures. It is deeply moated all round, and can only be entered by a bridge almost always raised. Although the walls, like those of the castle,

are six feet thick, it is surrounded up to half its height with a chemise, or second wall of large cut stone."

All idea of art or convenience was wholly foreign to the construction of these castles. They presented no idea of the agreeable; defense, safety, was the only idea manifested in them. The steepest and most savage places were chosen by these mediaeval architects and there the edifice was raised, destined solely to repel attacks effectually, and to shut up the inhabitants. All classes of mediaeval society protected themselves in this way; burghers and lords, ecclesiastics and laymen. The whole country was covered with them and they all had the same character, that of haunts and asylums. Safety was obtainable in no other way.

So much for the dwelling, but what was the life within? What influence must have been brought to bear upon the dweller in such a habitation, and the material circumstances which arose from it? In other words, what was feudal society? Here man dwelt alone and had no society save his own immediate family. He had no occupation and performed no duties of any kind. In the early days of Rome it was no uncommon thing for the nobility to labor in the field. Thus it was that Cincinnatus was found ploughing in the field when the messenger arrived summoning him to be dictator of Rome. Not so this noble German. He scorned each and every form of labor. It was not he who tilled the ground and trained the vine; he did not even hunt for support; he had no political activity. Says Guizot, "Never has there been such leisure and such isolation." He was distinctly a warrior and occupied his time in incursions, pillages, wars, and robberies. It was in such occupations as these that he found his pleasure. It was only from such a condition as this that those wonderful crusades could ever have emanated. Here, living alone, abandoned to himself, to the originality of his own nature, and the caprices of his own imagination, unchecked by any law and unrestrained by any refinement of feeling, he lived the life of a noble beast; brutal, ferocious, cruel, but in all things singular, strange, almost fantastic. It is almost impossible for a modern reader to get any true concept or form any just opinion of the life of this man.

Do you wonder why it took so long to civilize this man? The most prominent characteristic of feudal society was stubbornness. It had inherited all the strength, tenacity of purpose and stubborn courage of the Germanic races. Into no other society had new ideas, or manners, had so much trouble to penetrate. Civilization was more slow and difficult here than in any other age. Progress walked with halting step and justice slumbered on the way. All this was due to natural circumstances. Isolated within his castle, surrounded by an inferior and generally despised population, obliged to seek afar off, and by violent means, society and activity which he did not have about him, his own nature partook of this isolation and solitariness. He was formed very largely by his environment. Civilization is, after all, the product of ideas, and the walls, the moats, the ramparts, the turrets of his castle, shut out thought as well as the enemy, and civilization had to wait for cannon to batter down the walls before it could enter in and possess the land. Notwithstanding the castle for so many years closed its doors to civilization from without, there was yet a principle of civilization at work within. The walls protected the development of sentiments and manners which have played a powerful and beneficent part in modern society. The complete and happy development of domestic life, which is the crowning glory of modern civilization, and the respect in which woman is universally held are in large measure due to this long period of social isolation. Here it was that the family, father, mother, and children, lived in such close relationship, so bound and pressed together, so dependent upon one another for social intercourse and entertainment, that a bond of love, of common sympathy, and of common danger, seemed to hold the several family members together as nowhere else. It was here that the native coarseness and dominating spirit of the lord were softened and toned down. Here he learned to love and protect those that were dependent; to temper justice with mercy.

(b) But we must pass down the hill and become acquainted with the occupants of the little cluster of huts at its foot, the tributary population that cultivated the domains of the

lord. Nothing defends this village: nothing shelters it; it is exposed to all dangers and is a prey to continual vicissitudes; all the storms burst with full fury upon it: the four winds of heaven are here unrestrained. "No population ever lived more utterly destitute of peace and security, abandoned to a more violent incessantly renewed movement." Considered in itself this situation was unconditionally and radically vicious. There was nothing morally common between the holder of the fief and the serfs that tilled his soil. They were frequently of different race. They formed part of his estate; they were his property in the full sense of the word. It is impossible, however, to suppose that any people could live in such close union without having some bond of sympathy uniting them. So slaves were often held in highest respect and even love by their masters. It so happened that the kindest feelings oftentimes grew up between the "hill and the valley." This feeling, however, was wholly independent of the bonds uniting them.

By an analysis of that which precedes we will discover two fundamental feudal principles. The first is that peculiar theory of territorial proprietorship according to which ownership was vested in one, the lord or suzerain, while possession was enjoyed by another, the "man," or "vassal." The second of these principles was *the inseparable union of proprietorship with sovereignty*. It has already been made clear that the basis of all feudality was proprietorship. During this régime government was never administered by feudal kings upon any other basis than that of senior lord or proprietor. This is, indeed, the explanation of the statement of Louis XIV of France, "I am the State." He looked upon himself as the owner of all France and, as such, brooked no interference with his management of the estate. If this idea which lies at the base of all feudalism is thoroughly understood, it will greatly simplify this otherwise complex system of government.

If, now, we contrast the Roman, or magisterial, idea of jurisdiction with the feudal concept that took its place, we will see how great a change has been wrought. In the former, the idea of government was delegated from above and

was, therefore, impersonal, divine. The individual had nothing whatever to do with it. In the latter, government sprang from within as a necessary adjunct of the ownership of the land. It was, therefore, personal and responsible; a long step toward democracy.

During the flourishing period of feudalism the name *vassal* was not tainted with ignominy as it afterwards became. The relation of lord and vassal, being important and dignified, was established by certain traditional formalities. These were divided into homage and fealty, on the part of the man receiving the fief, and investiture, on the part of the person bestowing it. The two acts of homage and fealty were usually performed at the same time. The person who was to become the vassal kneeled before the lord and placed his two hands pressed together in those of the latter, who then raised him from his kneeling position and gave him the kiss of peace. Following this, the oath of fealty was taken upon the Gospels, or some relic deemed sacred by the contracting parties. The accomplishment of these two solemn acts transformed the person performing them into the lord's vassal, or *man*. At first this contract was unwritten, but by the middle of the twelfth century fealty and homage had merged into one act and a record of the ceremony was kept in writing. This record was called an *aveu* and was the report of the act by which an individual had "avowed" himself the man of some lord. At the same time that the lord, or suzerain, received the homage of his man, he handed to him some material object which symbolized the fief. This part of the ceremony was known as investiture. The investiture of a field was represented by a clod, of a forest by a branch: a prelate was given gloves, a crosier, and a pastoral ring. This ceremony of investiture was also put in written form in the twelfth century. Thus it was that in the later years of feudalism, the whole ceremony was represented by two documents; one, drawn up in the presence of a notary, witnessing the taking of the oath of fealty and homage, the other containing the *aveu* and *denombrement*, or written description of all that the fief comprised. These documents were placed in the safe keeping of the lord and furnished

sufficient evidence for the transference of a fief and the obligations attached thereto.

The vassal was expected to pay for his holding with services. If he withheld his services he forfeited his fief. These services were considered noble; they consisted chiefly of military service and judicial service. Military service was at the demand of the lord paramount and had to be rendered at the expense of the vassal. He was expected to present himself fully armed and mounted. Throughout the feudal period the Latin word *miles* must always be understood as meaning knight, as service on horseback was the only kind recognized in the feudal contract. The obligation of military service was quickly limited to a definite time, forty days being usually considered as its limit, and this but once a year. Whenever the lord administered justice he called his vassals to him, and it was their duty to attend his court, not only to aid in the administration of justice, but for themselves to be judged in case of need. They rendered their customary aid when the lord was a prisoner, to ransom him; when he knighted his eldest son, for the expenses; when he married his eldest daughter, for her wedding portion.

As we have already stated, if the vassal failed in the discharge of his duties he was considered a traitor and his lord might confiscate his fief; but so long as he was faithful to his obligations, the lord was bound to support him in his fief and defend him against every enemy. He must see that his vassal obtained justice, either in his own court or that of his superior lord.

The lord drew revenues from various sources; (1) those due him as sovereign with royal rights, such as aids, judicial fees, the fee of shipwreck, his claim to all goods that had no proprietor, the property of all outsiders who died on his soil, and etc; (2) the revenues which he received as landed proprietor, which varied extensively, but which consisted of the regular products of the domain, and the irregular returns of the lands held under the various feudal and non-feudal tenures.

During the growth of the institution of feudalism, even the church became feudalized. This process was begun by

Charlemagne. "Out of his universal empire in the West and out of his Institutes rose, to a great degree, the universal empire of the church and the whole mediaeval polity; feudalism itself." Charlemagne bestowed with munificent hand vast tracts of land and other property upon churches and monasteries. He endowed the church of St. Martin, in Tours, with lands in Italy. He also made munificent grants to St. Denys, to Lorch, to Fulda, to Prum, and Hersfeld, as well as many Italian abbeys. In these fiefs the bishop or abbot exercised all the rights of a feudal chieftain. At first, like all seigniorial privileges, their administration was limited, with appeal to a higher court, or in the last resort, to the king. Gradually they acquired power over all causes and all persons, while the right of appeal fell into desuetude. The church, by this plan, continually grew richer and richer. We have one celebrated example of this in the inventory furnished by the abbot of St. Germain des Pres, Irminon: "It appears from this list, or register, that the abbey, before being pillaged by Normans, owned nearly one hundred thousand acres, on which were living about three thousand families, and which brought in at least two millions in revenues." As the feudal system became finally established, abbots continued to be important persons, and were often employed at the king's court, but they were far from being the most important persons in the hierarchy. Bishops became actual feudal lords, with their mesne, that is, their land considered as a whole, from whose revenues they lived, they and their clerical household. They also held, in the same way, vassals, from whom they exacted homage and services. Abbeys were often granted to bishops as a portion of their feudal holdings. Besides their ecclesiastical jurisdiction, to which their priests were subject, they exercised also high and low justice over their men. They acknowledged feudal obligations to the king like any other vassals, and as they themselves were forbidden to perform military service, this duty was performed for them by one or more of their vassals. "Thus the hierarchy, now a feudal institution, parallel to and coordinate with the temporal feudal aristocracy, aspired to enjoy and actually before long did enjoy, the dignity, the

wealth, the power of suzerain lords. Bishops and abbots had the independence and privileges of inalienable fiefs; and at the same time began either sullenly to contest, or haughtily to refuse, those payments or acknowledgments of vas-salage, which sometimes weighed heavily on other lands. During the reign of Charlemagne this theory of spiritual immunity slumbered, or rather had not quickened into life. It was boldly (so rapid was its growth) announced in the strife with his son, Louis the Pious. It was then asserted by the hierarchy (become king-maker and king-deposer) that all property given to the church, to the poor, and to the servants of God, or rather to the saints, to God himself (such were the specious phrases) was given absolutely, irrevocably, with no reserve. The king might have power over knights' fees, over those of the church he had none whatever. Such claims were imperious, sacrilegious, and implied forfeiture of eternal life. The clergy and their estates belonged to another realm, another commonwealth; they were entirely, absolutely independent of the civil power. The clergy belonged to the Herr-bann of Christ, and of Christ alone."

To a person who comes to the study of feudalism with fixed ideas of government and polity gathered from Roman imperialism, this form of government must seem strangely like anarchy and confusion. And yet there is an enormous difference between a society which has thrown off all common bonds and actually broken into fragments that are wholly isolated, and another in which, however fragmentary in appearance, a lively and constantly recognized theory keeps in remembrance the rights and prerogatives of the central government and asserts without ceasing that there is a vital bond of union between all the fragments.

It is this that feudalism did. It was an arrangement suited to crude and barbarous times, by which an advanced political organization belonging to a more orderly civilization might be carried through such times without destruction. It was at best but class civilization in which the entire population was divided into two strata; those with rights, growing out of the feudal contract, and those without rights. By this system personal loyalty was developed in contrast

with submission to positive law, and certain germs of liberty were kept alive and fostered under a contract entered into by every individual recognized in the feudal state. It was far from an ideal government; it was far from the government which Charlemagne intended to establish, but it held the germs of personal liberty, and was a great advance over no government.

The result of man's attempts up to this time, to found a rational civilization, may be estimated thus: The Roman imperial attempt at civilization exhibited its unnatural, and consequently inadequate, character in that it allowed the will of one man to hamper and control the development of nations. Individualism is the exact antithesis of Imperialism. In systematizing the opposite principle of individualism, feudalism did not find the secret of social organization, but, on the contrary, instead of introducing the reign of right principles between man and man, it suffered ten thousand petty despots to substitute for absolutism on a magnificent scale, local and petty, and, hence, more galling tyranny. It was, however, the rude and desperate assertion of some men to be self-determining factors in their own social organization against a system which made most men inert cogs in the machinery of the state. Feudalism has been called "the revel of barbarism." It was rather the "carnival of freedom." It contains the prophecy of better things. A thousand fold better is the extravagance of exuberant life than the paralysis of death.

## CHAPTER XXVIII

### THE CRUSADES

“**T**HE term crusades is generally given to a series of military adventures by which the Western Christians attempted to conquer and hold Palestine from the Mohammedans.” In a somewhat broader sense they were “expeditions of armed Christians against Pagans, heretics, and Moslems.” The period of the crusades lasted almost exactly two hundred years from the despairing appeal made by Alexius Comneus, Emperor of the East, and the preaching of Peter the Hermit which stirred the population of southern France into a frenzy of passion, in 1095, to the humiliating retreat of the seven surviving knights of the Hospital from the garrison of Acre, in 1291.

This great movement shows conclusively that Christianity had taken a leaf out of the Mohammedan book and turned aside from the spiritual warfare and conquests of the first three hundred years to grasp the sword and enter into a military contest for the re-possession of the land that had been snatched from Christians by the followers of the Prophet.

The crusades were divided according to the field of operations, into (a) Eastern, and (b) Western Crusades.

#### (a) EASTERN CRUSADES

*First Crusade*, 1096–1099, under Godfrey, established the Kingdom of Jerusalem. Kingdom lasts 90 years.

*Second Crusade*, preached by St. Bernard and led by Conrad and Louis VII, set forth in 1147, fifty years after the First Crusade. Disastrous.

*Third Crusade*, under Barbarossa, Philip of France and Richard of England, is defeated by Saladin in 1190. Barbarossa lost his life, Philip returned home and Richard made a truce with Saladin.

*Fourth Crusade.* The Latin fleet under Baldwin achieves the conquest of Constantinople in 1204.

*Fifth Crusade,* Frederic II is made King of Jerusalem by treaty in 1227.

*Sixth Crusade,* 1248–1254, Louis IX of France made a disastrous campaign in Egypt and captured Damietta, but was afterwards taken prisoner and most of his army died of a plague.

*Seventh Crusade.* Louis IX made a second attempt upon Egypt but dies in Tunis, in 1270.

(b) WESTERN CRUSADES

- (1) The Norman Conquest of England, 1066.
- (2) Spanish Crusade in 1086.
- (3) Albigensian Crusade in 1208; carried out by Simon De Montfort and his men; incited by Innocent III.
- (4) Prussian Crusade, 1230.

It is foreign to the purpose of this sketch to enter into any extended discussion of the various crusades, but a brief statement is essential to the understanding of their purpose and achievement.

*The first crusade* was the greatest and was destined to accomplish more than any other that followed. The earliest chronicles represented it as entered into by six million people first and last, but this is undoubtedly vastly exaggerated. Three hundred thousand would be nearer the truth. William of Malmesbury, a contemporaneous chronicler, says of the motley throng which flocked to the Holy Land: “The most distant islands and savage countries were inspired with this ardent passion. The Welshman left his hunting, the Scotchman his fellowship with vermin, the Dane his drinking party, the Norwegian his raw fish. There was no regard to relationship; patriotism was held in light esteem; God alone was placed before their eyes.” The vanguard was a motley throng of men, women and children under Walter the Penniless, Peter the Hermit and Gottschalk, a priest of rather unsavory reputation. These were practically all destroyed either by disease and famine upon the journey or by the sword of the Sultan David before the walls of Nicaea.

After these came the real crusaders under the leadership of the most noble of the knights of France. The great host of men which set out under the banners of these knights, melted away like snow under a south wind, but the remnant of them captured Antioch, on the 3rd of June, 1098, and put the garrison to the sword. The following year they marched to Jerusalem and set siege to the city which surrendered on the 15th of July, 1099. The inhabitants were nearly all massacred and Godfrey, the noblest knight of them all, who had taken a leading part in the wanton destruction of defenseless life, was made king of the new Latin Kingdom which was created. Antioch and Edessa were raised to independent principalities.

For a time the little Latin kingdoms, established by the soldiers of the first crusade, flourished and gave promise of being worth the great cost of their planting. But mutual jealousies and strife weakened them and opened the way for Moslem inroads. Within fifty years they were threatened with destruction. News of this reached the West and Bernard of Clairvaux took up the cause and preached *a second crusade* with such fiery zeal and eloquence that Louis VII of France and Conrad III, the first of the great Hohenstaufen rulers, set out for the Holy Land with two large armies in 1147. This crusade proved a total failure. Conrad's army was destroyed by the Turks near Iconium, while that of Louis was wrecked in the mountain passes beyond Laodicea. Conrad went back with the remnant of his troops to Europe and the following year Louis returned to France.

*The third crusade*, 1189–1192, was undertaken by the combined forces of Frederic Barbarossa, Philip Augustus, and Richard the Lion-Hearted. Its purpose was to win back Jerusalem which had been captured, in October of 1187, by the brilliant young Kurdish chief Salah-Eddin (Saladin). This was preeminently the crusade of romance where Christian and Moslem vied with each other in all courtly graces and knightly deeds of honor. Neither Turk nor Christian won any marked advantage, but by treaty between Saladin and Richard, Christians were to have the right to make their pilgrimages untaxed and unmolested.

*The fourth crusade* was launched in 1202–1204, at the instigation of Pope Innocent III, who had been elevated to the chair of St. Peter in 1198. The leaders of this crusade were Theobald, count of Champagne, Louis, count of Blois and Chartres, Simon de Montfort, and Walter of Brienne. With these a little later, went Geoffrey, marshal of Champagne, and Baldwin, count of Flanders. The Venetians, by compact, furnished the vessels for carrying the troops to the Holy Land. This crusade turned aside from its ostensible purpose to attack and capture the city of Constantinople. It surrendered to Baldwin, count of Flanders, April, 1204, and was sacked and very largely destroyed by the drunken soldiery. Baldwin, count of Flanders, was elected emperor of the East, in the stead of Alexios, the Greek. A new patriarch of Constantinople was chosen, Thomas Morosini, a friend of Innocent III, and for a time all Christendom was united under the pope of Rome, but this was brought about "by the greatest crime of the Middle Ages, for it was the first step toward the overthrow of the Greek and the introduction of the Turkish power in Europe."

*The fifth crusade* was undertaken in 1228, by the emperor Frederic II without the support of any of the great rulers of the West. Frederic was a man of marvelous ability, acquainted with Moslem arts and philosophy, and the most liberal minded ruler of his age. He attempted to accomplish by diplomacy what others had failed to do by force, and in this he was singularly successful. Jerusalem, Jaffa, Bethlehem, and Nazareth were ceded by treaty to the Latins. The Mosque of Omar alone was retained by the Moslems. But the haughty and stubborn old Pope Gregory IX, who had excommunicated Frederic for his tardiness in setting out upon his crusade, now cursed him for his successful treaty and return. "Such was the reward of the man who had done more toward the re-establishment of the Latin Kingdom in Palestine than had been done by the Lion-Hearted Richard and who, it may fairly be said, had done it without shedding a drop of blood."

In 1248, Louis IX of France and Prince Edward of England undertook to win back to Christendom what had been

lost by the destructive inroads of the Korasmians who had been driven from their homes by the brutal hordes of Genghis Khan, only to ravage and lay waste, in their turn, Syria and Palestine. But feudalism which had made the crusades possible had been pretty much destroyed in the two hundred years of constant struggle and the people had grown weary of bloodshed and carnage. Failure met the crusaders on every step. Louis IX was taken prisoner at Damietta and Edward was called home by the death of his father to become king of England. The Templars and other military orders which had done such royal service in the past were glad to leave the country and the Saracens who held Palestine at the time of the first crusade were still masters at the end.

Having given a very brief summary of the main crusades to the East our attention must now be turned to the West, where a series of crusades took place in nature somewhat different from those that were aimed against the Moslem or the Greek.

The Norman Conquest of England may well be called a crusade although it was carried on against a people more truly Christian than were those who were commissioned by Pope Alexander II to conquer them. Hildebrand, in furthering his vast theory of papal control, was the inspirer of the expedition by which William of Normandy hoped to crush the free English people and take the throne from Harold who had been chosen by the free voice of the English people. Under the sacred standard which was sent to him by Alexander, William gathered a motley host of adventurers who were promised entrance into heaven if they fell in this holy undertaking. The pope had exacted a promise from William to hold England as a fief of the church in case he succeeded in his undertaking. The religious enthusiasm which animated William's followers was inspired by the thought of the broad acres to which they looked forward as the recompense of their toil. It is to be noted that so soon as William felt himself secure upon his throne he repudiated his promise to the pope and held England free from all papal interference and exactions not sanctioned by himself beforehand.

The Albigensian crusade, on the face of it, had a motive quite different from any heretofore discussed. It might be maintained that the unbelief of the Saracen was reason sufficient for snatching from him a country which was looked upon as the inalienable heritage of Christendom. It had been the policy of the church from the third century on, to wage unrestrained war against all persons accused truly or falsely of heresy if gentler measures failed. To burn was a quicker remedy than to reason. So while Baldwin and his followers were laying the foundations of the flimsy and short-lived Latin empire at Constantinople, the great Innocent III was preaching a crusade of extermination against the peaceable subjects of Count Raymond of Toulouse. — All manner of vile persons flocked to take a part in this crusade and the Pope held before them the inducement of rich plunder. History knows no baser chapter of cruelty, fraud and crime than the crusade against the Albigensians, yet Innocent III not only sanctioned it all, but praised the acts of brutality and license as done for the cause of Christ. Thousands of little children were wantonly murdered; old and defenseless men and women were cut down by brutal soldiery under instructions from the papal legate to "slay all; God will know his own." "Never in any history were the principles of justice, the faith of treaties, common humanity, so trampled under foot as in the Albigensian crusade."

The Prussian crusade was undertaken against the barbarian Wends and Poles by the Teutonic Knights, in 1226, at the instigation of Pope Honorius III. These barbarians had been appealed to in vain by missionaries and had undertaken a war of extermination against the Christians and burnt or destroyed all churches and chapels that came in their way. A new order was founded for the protection of Christians called the Order of the Knights of Prussia, but nearly all of this order perished shortly after in the disastrous battle of Strasburg. In the distress which followed, Conrad, Duke of Masovia, invited the aid of the Teutonic Knights who came under the leadership of their Grand Master, Herman of Salza. The whole country was finally reduced to submission, the people being compelled to accept

Christianity at the point of the sword. German colonists were brought in to occupy the territory which had been laid waste by the war. Cities were rebuilt and the country brought under cultivation. Pope Innocent IV divided the territory into three bishoprics — Culm, Pomerania, and Ermeland (1243). After the close of the crusade another bishopric was founded at Somland by Ottocar, King of Bohemia. The German colonists intermarried with the Wends and Poles, thus forming the Prussian people of today.

It is a common occurrence in considering some important act of an individual, for the question to arise: Why did he do it? What motive did he have? The question is as difficult to answer as it is common. The motive which caused the act is usually hidden away within the mind of the actor. So the impelling causes of the crusades were cloaked in the minds of the multitudes that took part in them. Milman has a passage that is especially appropriate here: "When all the motives which stir the human mind and heart, the most impulsive passion and the profoundest policy, conspire together, it is impossible to discover which is the dominant influence in guiding to a certain cause of action."

Old Testament religion made much of sacred places and these were resorted to frequently by the Israelites. Hebron, Bethel, and Shiloh became the centers of Jewish religion until, in later ages, Jerusalem took their place and became the shrine of Jewish religion. The law required every one to make a journey to the temple at Jerusalem at least once a year. This was mainly for the purpose of worship and instruction, but to the average Jew the place itself became holy and his journey little less than a pilgrimage. The early Christians were usually all Jews and it was but natural that they should have the same feeling toward places made sacred by the presence of their Master. Jesus himself did nothing to encourage any such feeling. Indeed, he gave emphasis to the thought that no place was especially sacred. "The hour cometh," he said, "when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet in Jerusalem, worship the Father; . . . when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth."

But the custom of their ancestors was stronger than a precept of Jesus, and as Christianity spread it came continually under the influence of pagan practices of consulting local oracles and venerating places made sacred to them by the presence of their gods and heroes. These forms became an ever-pressing temptation to the early Christian church. The land trodden by the feet of Jesus became a holy land. Here heaven was nearer than anywhere else. Particular places made sacred by some association, act, or suffering of the Lord Jesus, were marked out and became the object of special reverence. Thus the actual places where Jesus was born, lived, rose from the grave, ascended into heaven, became of such religious importance that Christians began to make special journeys to these. This tendency on the part of the multitude was quickened into a very passion for pilgrimage by the visit to the Holy Land of Constantine and his mother Helena. Following the identification of the cave in which Jesus was born in Bethlehem and the sepulcher at Jerusalem, the emperor and his mother erected splendid churches over these spots. These now became for Christians what the sacred stone at Mecca and the tomb of the prophet at Medina subsequently became to the followers of Islam. After this pilgrimages became more and more frequent, the pilgrims having all manner of honors bestowed upon them on their journey and looked upon as heroes on their return. "From the depths of the German forests, from the banks of the Seine, and the bleak shores of Britain, as well as from the cities of southern Europe, poured the incessant streams of humanity, to bathe in the Jordan where the Lord was baptized, or perchance to die at the tomb which witnessed his resurrection."

A systematic effort was put forth early in the fourth century to facilitate these pilgrimages by mapping out the best course to be taken across Europe and Asia Minor. Along these roads hospitals were established at great cost by pious and sympathetic persons for the free entertainment of pilgrims. Contributions for the support of these hospitals were sent in abundance by those who remained at home and who thought that such a work was worthy of the special

blessing of Heaven. Pilgrims were placed under the special protection of the law and were exempted from paying toll, and commended by kings to the hospitality of their subjects. Charlemagne went so far in his favor as to command his subjects throughout his vast empire to supply pilgrims at least with lodging, fire, and water. A splendid hospital was built at Jerusalem out of money contributed by Gregory the Great. So the pilgrim set forth in every way a privileged character, with the blessings and prayers of his kindred or the community among whom he lived. The simple accouterments which announced his purpose and which served his needs were the staff, the wallet, and the scallop-shell.<sup>115</sup> While pilgrimages were at first undertaken in order to gaze upon the places made sacred by the presence of the Lord and in this manner to quicken the zeal and religious fervor of the devout, as time went on they were looked upon as an expiation for sin. Bathing in the Jordan became a second baptism and washed away all the sins of life and assured a triumphant entrance into heaven. The shirt which the pilgrim wore when he entered Jerusalem was carefully laid away to be used as a winding sheet which, like the carpet of Solomon, gave the power of transporting him to the realms of the blessed. But the beholding of Jerusalem and the assurance of eternal salvation for the pilgrim was not the only reward. He found there an emporium of relics and returned home bearing a splinter from the true cross or some other memorial of the Savior. The demand for relics grew to enormous proportions and a regular trade grew up in these, but the supply ever kept pace with the demand.<sup>116</sup> The story goes that Helena, the mother of Constantine, when visiting Jerusalem miraculously discovered the true cross buried with two others upon the site of the crucifixion. The tablet which Pilate had attached to it had fallen off and it was impossible to tell which of the three was the one upon which Jesus was crucified. Recourse was had to miracle. Each cross, in turn, was laid upon a dead woman. The first two produced no effect, but when the third was placed upon her, the woman immediately arose from the dead. The marvel was unhesitatingly accepted by the people. The cross was

carried off by Chosroes, in 611, but was restored to the Greek emperor, after a ten years' war, and re-erected upon the assumed site of Calvary. Like Mark Twain's Charter Oak, this cross has furnished wood enough to build a city.

For more than two hundred years the tide of pilgrimage flowed on without interruption. Then came the conquest of Jerusalem by Chosroes II, the king of Persia, in 611, and a brief check upon the influx of Christians until Heraclius overthrew the fire-worshippers and regained the Christian emblem, in 628.

Scarce eight years passed after the completion of the war with Persia and the return of the true cross, when the Mohammedan forces penetrated the Greek provinces, captured Damascus, and advanced and laid siege to the Holy City. After a siege of less than four months the city capitulated and received the terms offered by Omar, the second Khalif after Mohammed. For the terms granted to the Christians see the chapter on Mohammed and his Teachings (Chapter XXV). This capture of the Holy City was looked upon by the Mohammedans as of very great importance, as next to Mecca and Medina, it was held in veneration by the Arabs. They claimed Abraham as their ancestor and they revered the Jewish prophets and venerated Jesus as the man of supreme sanctity but not divine. The Christians were allowed to continue their worship as usual, but with some restrictions. They saw the Mosque of Omar rise upon the site of the Temple of Jerusalem and the cross come down from their own churches, but the Mohammedans themselves believed in pilgrimages to sacred places and, therefore, did not interfere with the Christian pilgrims. So the stream of pilgrims soon reached its wonted size and Mohammedan Jerusalem was to them still a Holy City.

For nearly four hundred years after the submission of the Greek patriarch to Omar, the West had sent forth its troops of pilgrims without let or hindrance. They underwent nothing which could excite anger or raise the indignation of the Christians. With the pilgrims went also numerous mendicants who found a source of great profit in the traffic which had sprung up not only in relics but in spices, silks, gems,

and laces, and other products of the far East. In the meantime ignorance and superstition kept alive the wonders of the Holy Land. Bishop Arculf told of having seen the *three Tabernacles* still standing upon the Mount of Transfiguration. Bernard of Brittany as an eye-witness described the angel who came from heaven each Easter morn to light the lamp above the Holy Sepulcher. Innumerable stories only a little less picturesque than the above were told and unquestioningly accepted by the credulity of the people.

At the beginning of the ninth century Charlemagne took upon himself the protection of Christians throughout the world. He gave large sums of money to assist in the building and protection of churches in Syria, and he entered into treaties with Mohammedan rulers for the security of the lives and property of Christians. The amicable relations between himself and Haroun-al-Raschid (the wise) brought to Charlemagne that which he considered the most precious of all his gifts, the keys of the holy sepulcher, and an assurance of a further extension of privileges to pilgrims.

In the year 1000 there was an almost universal belief among Christians of the quick-coming end of the world. This brought with it a strong religious movement which came about from the expectation of the coming judgment of the Lord. Pilgrimages to the Holy Land greatly increased in numbers. Men of all classes crowded to Jerusalem that they might be present at the great assize when the Lord set up his judgment seat in the valley of Jehoshaphat. More people than Otto III were disappointed when the year 1000 went by without bringing with it the end of all things. A brief revival of persecution under Hakim, the fanatic Sultan of Egypt, resulted in the destruction of the Church of the Holy Sepulcher and many other Christian buildings in Jerusalem; thousands of Christians were slain and pilgrims were for a time halted and refused admittance to the city. After a brief period, however, they were again permitted to resume their wonted devotions within the walls of the Holy City, but were required to pay a small toll before passing the gates. Again pilgrims came and went without interruption for more than a generation when a new danger arose.

— The easy tolerations granted to Christians by the polished Mohammedan Khalifs was destroyed by the savage and war-like Turks. This mongrel race had overthrown the cultured Mohammedan rulers of the East and taken over the government. They had been converted to Mohammedanism but had rejected everything in this religion which tended to a higher civilization, while they eagerly embraced all that was barbarous and aggressive. Their ruler, Toucush, became master of Jerusalem in 1076, and quickly inaugurated a system of extortion and robbery in the place of the previous easy-going tolerance. Pilgrims were insulted and holy places violated. The Greek patriarch was thrown into prison and held for a large ransom. But these outrages, and the tyranny of the rulers of Jerusalem could not stop or even seriously check the unexhausted passion for pilgrimages. Added danger only seemed to fan the flame and pilgrims pushed on in holy zeal ready for wounds and death at the hands of the unbelievers. —

At length the persecution of pilgrims and the desecration of the holy places found a voice. Throughout the length and breadth of Christendom a fierce indignation was stirring the hearts of men, and guidance and a plan were only lacking to carry this storm of hatred and thirst for revenge against the infidel. These elements were now furnished by the pope, Urban II, who saw that the time was ripe for the crusade against the Moslem and the winning of the Holy Land for Christianity which Sylvester II and Gregory VII had in vain advocated. Urban summoned a council at Clermont in the territories of the count of Auvergne, in 1095, and set out from his old home in the monastery of Clugny, in order to be present at the meeting. When he arrived at the meeting-place he found the city full to overflowing of attendants and thousands of tents pitched outside the walls for those who could find no resting-place within. The council sat for a period of eight days, regulating the enterprise which had been little more than mentioned at the previous council of Piacenza. It was now up to Urban to set in motion those invasions of the East which form so striking a feature of the history of the Middle Age. Before he permitted the council

to adjourn he delivered an address before the assembled multitude which for eloquence, force, and fire has been seldom equalled, never surpassed. Urban ascended a lofty scaffold erected for the purpose and began his address: — “ You must show the strength of your righteousness in a precious work which is not less your concern than the Lord’s. For it behoves you to hasten to carry to your brethren dwelling in the East the aid so often promised and so urgently needed. For the Turks and the Arabs have attacked them, as many of you know, and have advanced into the territory of Roumania as far as that port of the Mediterranean which is called the Arm of St. George (the Hellespont); and, having penetrated farther and farther into the country of those Christians, have already seven times conquered them in battle, have killed and captured many, have destroyed the churches and desolated the kingdom. If you permit them to remain for a time unmolested they will extend their sway more widely over many faithful servants of the Lord.

“ Wherefore, I pray and exhort, nay, not I, but the Lord prays and exhorts you, as heralds of Christ, at all times to urge men of all ranks, peasants and knights, the poor equally with the rich, to hasten to exterminate this vile race from the land ruled by our brethren, and to bear timely aid to the worshippers of Christ. I speak to those who are present, I shall proclaim it to the absent, but it is Christ who commands. The wealth of your enemies shall be yours; ye shall plunder their treasures. Ye serve a commander who will not permit his soldiers to want bread, or a just reward for their services. Moreover, if those who set out thither lose their lives on the journey, by land or sea, or in fighting against the heathen, their sins shall be remitted in that hour; this I grant through the power of God vested in me.” —

It is stated that Urban was scarcely able to finish his address by reason of the interruptions; murmurs of grief and indignation. When he had closed a great shout went up: “ It is the will of God! It is the will of God!” The assembly voted itself the army of God. But the pope was not satisfied. He ordered all of the bishops to preach the crusade in every discourse. ✓

Among those who helped mightily in fanning the popular enthusiasm was Peter, a little monk of Amiens, better known as Peter the Hermit, who went through southern France preaching the crusade with tremendous zeal. He has been represented generally as the originator of the first crusade and the one who won over Urban to undertake the task. But this idea has been completely refuted by a careful study of the sources.

If now, we turn aside from the religious motives which impelled the crusades, we will still be able to find other motives, as mankind can scarcely be said ever to have acted wholly from religious impulse. Not long preceding the beginning of the crusades Europe had been overrun by swarms of German barbarians. Visigoths, Ostrogoths, Vandals, Burgundians, Franks, and Anglo-Saxons had laid waste the Western Roman empire and destroyed the magnificent civilization built up by more than a thousand years of Roman rule. Cities were destroyed and the art of building them lost; Roman agriculture, which has scarcely been surpassed in our day, was ruined and the fields left to grow up in brambles and forests; sheep and cattle were eaten up, or wantonly destroyed by the hundreds of thousands of untamed men that wandered over the fertile plains of Gaul and Italy, and none raised to take their places. When the Anglo-Saxons were through with the conquest of Britain, that country was little less than a howling wilderness and waited for more than a hundred years for monks to teach the Saxon warrior the art of agriculture and stock-raising. The result of all this was the failure of the food supply and consequent want and poverty. There were too many men engaged in destruction and not enough men engaged in the arts of peace-productive industries. This made the common people restless and eager for any change. Again, the ruling princes of Germany, France and England were continually embarrassed by court intrigues and the turbulent and independent spirit of the greater feudal nobility. Some of these princes were far-sighted enough to see that their own power would be increased either by conquest abroad or by the absence on a crusade of the nobles already grown too powerful. Conrad

III of Germany and Louis VII of France may be cited as examples of this kind of ambitious motive. Then there was the great feudal aristocracy which made the back-bone of nearly every crusade. To this body of constitutional warriors there was furnished the fierce pastime of war on a grand scale instead of the petty quarrels with neighboring chieftains. War formed the main occupation, I might say the only occupation, of these men: this was the only delight of their lives, and now the opportunity had come to indulge their ungoverned passions under the garb of religion. There was also the prospect of vast and permanent conquest. If the noble left behind a fair domain, possibly encumbered by mortgage by reason of his wild living, he could look forward with the hope of winning something far greater. To the non-feudal population and to the serfs who accompanied their lords to the East there was held out the offer of a method of wiping out all guilt from their souls without changing their character or disposition. It was to them a new and rather taking way of salvation. The broad road which they had hitherto been following, "the primrose path to the everlasting bonfire," now suddenly became a narrow and rugged path to heaven. Their debts were forgiven and their dependents looked after by the church.

To Cardinal Baronius, the historian of the church down to the year 1198, belongs the honor of designating the period then ceasing as that of the Dark Ages. The term has lived on because of its fitness. It was, indeed, but a few generations since the people that had inherited Roman civilization had been pretty much exterminated and the lands, as has been previously stated, reverted to forest and marsh. Huns held Italy from 900 to 930; Rollo the Dane overran and conquered Normandy in 911, and in 1029 the Normans possessed themselves of the south of Italy and the greater part of the island of Sicily. This was, indeed, an age of gross ignorance. Culture was not entirely extinct as there were some men whose genius and virtues would have adorned any age. Such a man was Gerbert, Pope Sylvester II, who died in 1003, and whose learning was the wonder of the age. The early schoolmen, too, Lanfranc, Anselm, and Berengar, may be

mentioned as great thinkers and logicians, and Hildebrand has taken a place among the world's greatest men. But the intellectuality of this period was wholly concerned with theological and religious subjects. Of literature there was none, as that of Rome and Greece had been lost or destroyed and nothing new had as yet been produced. The few manuscripts that existed were the property of monasteries or of the more wealthy nobility, who kept them as a sort of ornamental furniture rather than any particular use. Very few of the nobility could read but signed with a (X) cross when their names were necessary for a deed or treaty. The priests committed to memory the Latin service, but could not translate it, reciting with the tongues of parrots. They knew absolutely nothing of the magnificent civilization which lay back of them. Thought was discouraged and looked upon with suspicion as heresy. Roger Bacon, who lived at the close of the crusading period, was imprisoned for fourteen years because he had the boldness to suggest a rational method of viewing the world. The industrial arts were lost or were absolutely neglected after the conquest of the barbarians had swept away the Roman civilization and centuries went by without any attempt to revive them.

The life of the common people was sordid and pitiful beyond expression. The vast majority of them lived in the country in a condition of complete isolation from their fellows. They had a few stunted and deformed cattle; they plowed their little fields with a sharpened stick, drawn by a cow and a woman yoked together, and trusted to most primitive methods in hunting the wild game and fishing the streams for food sufficient to support their families. If serfs, they lived huddled together in hamlets at the foot of some hill, crowned by the castle of their lord who gave them some protection in return for service. Their homes were dreary hovels, roofed with straw, without windows and without flooring other than clay and cow manure pounded together, and overrun with vermin. The death rate from preventable diseases was appalling, especially among children.

Dense ignorance bred the wildest and most unbelievable superstition. The noises of the night were wrought into

voices of ghosts and the winds that rustled the leaves of the forest or moaned through the branches of the winter-stripped trees, was the groaning of the lost souls of sinners. The deeds of demons were mixed with those of men and were recorded by the chroniclers of the age with equal gravity and received with unbounded faith. A falling star was a portent of calamity, and the appearance of a comet was the dread harbinger of war.

Upon the preaching of Urban and the decision of the council of Clermont to undertake a crusade, the masses broke into the wildest enthusiasm, and without taking any thought touching equipment, or provision for the journey, and in absolute ignorance of the distance to be travelled and the dangers and hardships to be met and subdued, they secured the quandam leadership of the discredited knight, Walter the Penniless, and the hairbrained Peter the Hermit, and set out without awaiting the more orderly army of knights. They paid with their lives for their foolishness.

While the regular army of knights and their retainers was not guilty of the excesses, crimes, and foolishness that the rabbles of Walter and Peter the Hermit engaged in, still thousands of them perished on the way to the East, and only a handful of the host which set out stood before the walls of Antioch and assisted in the siege of that city. The crusading forces had starved on the long journey they had made and now they were unable to restrain themselves when they beheld the wide valleys and the fruitful fields already ripe for the harvest and the vintage. The cattle, the corn and the wine, were wasted with no thought of the morrow and as the siege progressed the Christians were threatened with famine. The siege went on with varying success until June, 1098, when the city was betrayed to Bohemond and more than 10,000 Turks were put to the sword, only a remnant shutting themselves up in the citadel and preparing to defend themselves to the last. Again the Christians turned from famine to feasting and gave themselves up to the wildest dissipation and riot. Food which might have lasted for months was wasted in a week. And then the news reached them that the Persian army was almost at the gates. The crusaders now

massed in the city with no provisions for a siege, found themselves beset in the rear by the Turks within the citadel, and from without by a well-equipped Persian army. At the last extremity superstition came to their aid and a priest assured the soldiers that he had seen in a vision the Savior himself, attended by his Virgin Mother, and the Prince of the Apostles and . . . had received a distinct assurance that in five days they should have the aid they needed. Again the crusaders were filled with hope and Peter Barthelmy, chaplain to Raymond of Toulouse, seized the opportunity of recounting a vision which had come to him. "St. Andrew had appeared and revealed the fact that in the Church of St. Peter lay hidden the steel head of the spear which had pierced the side of the Redeemer as he hung upon the cross. This Holy Lance should win them victory over all their enemies." Two days were spent in devotion, after which they were to search for the long-lost weapon. Upon the third day the workmen began to dig and labored through the hours without success. "When night approached the priest, bare-footed and with a single garment went down into the pit which had been made by the laborers; for a time the strokes of his spade resounded, and then the sacred relic was found, carefully wrapped in a veil of silk and gold." The Holy Lance was borne by the papal legate Adhemar of Puy, and the forces, thus inspired, fought with such fierceness that the enemy finally withdrew in confusion. Superstition can sometimes win battles.

The crusaders passed on from Antioch to Jerusalem and set siege to the city which was taken by storm in July, 1099. And now was enacted such a scene of carnage as has rarely been seen in the pages of history. Says Dean Milman: "No barbarian, no infidel, no Saracen, perpetuated such wanton and cold-blooded atrocities of cruelty as the wearers of the Cross of Christ (who, it is said, had fallen on their knees and burst into a pious hymn at the first view of the Holy City), on the capture of that city. Murder was mercy, rape tenderness, simple plunder, the mere assertion of the conqueror's right. Children were seized by their legs, some of them plucked from their mothers' breasts and dashed

against the walls, or whirled from the battlements. Others were obliged to leap from the walls; some tortured, roasted by slow fires. They ripped up prisoners to see if they had swallowed gold. Of 70,000 Saracens there were not left enough to bury the dead.

"Never before or since was there ever such exalted faith combined with such grotesque superstition, such splendid self-sacrifice mingled with cruel and unrestrained selfishness, such holy purpose with its wings entangled, torn, and besmeared in vicious environments."

What was the general effect of the great crusade movement? This question is rather difficult to answer and has been looked upon in various ways by different historians. There was, no doubt, a mixture of good and evil in them, but the line of cleavage between these is difficult to locate. The results may be classified under three heads: (a) Intellectual, (b) Political, and (c) Ecclesiastical.

We have shown something of the condition of Europe at the inauguration of the crusades in the eleventh century. Comparing this with what could be seen in the thirteenth century when the force of the movement was spent and militant faith had given up the struggle for the Holy Land, an entirely new picture presents itself. In every line of human endeavor change is seen to a remarkable degree. Intellectuality had increased and asserted its right to dominate mere brute force. The association of the crusaders from the West, where everything was as yet raw and undeveloped, with Saracens and Greeks who had for centuries enjoyed both wealth and culture, necessarily broadened their minds and taught them many things far in advance of what they knew at home. They learned something of the science of government from the Moslem and the Greek; unity of national purpose and action. Of especial value was the knowledge attained in matters of municipalities, for they were compelled to note that Cairo and Damascus were better governed in every way than were Paris and London.

Commerce also received an immense impulse in the crusades and trading vessels spread their sails upon all seas. For two hundred years a line of ships plied to and fro between

the ports of the eastern and western Mediterranean, carrying supplies to the soldiers. An English fleet transported the army of Richard I along the Atlantic coast. Men learned how to load ships with the utmost economy of space and, by tacking, to sail them in all winds. Roads were built especially throughout southern France and Italy, which converged to the port of departure from the surrounding country. Upon these produce of all kinds was conveyed for shipment and a great impulse was given to productive industries. This fostered the commercial habit and skill which were utilized in times of yeace. Leagues of merchants were formed for self-protection against pirates and high-way robbers. Maritime laws were codified and generally enforced upon the Mediterranean. Bills of exchange, borrowed from the usage of the Jews, were in vogue early in the thirteenth century. This growth in trade increased the wealth of the common people and introduced new articles of food and dress, thus raising the scale of living everywhere. To supply these new demands manufacturing grew apace and invention was stimulated. Domestic arts took their place in the foremost line of the new civilization which was dawning.

Perhaps the greatest changes brought about by the crusades were political. These touched the whole life of Europe. Every rank and class of society were profoundly influenced.

By the overthrow of the pagan Wends and Poles of Prussia, and their Christianization by the sword a large territory was added to Christendom and a new and dangerous element injected into European polities.

The Albigensian and Spanish Crusades helped to unify France and Spain. The Albigensian crusade destroyed the old population of southern France that had been independent in religion and polities from the time of Clovis, and filled the vacant places with a population from the great feudatories of the North of France. By the end of the reign of St. Louis, this entire territory, with its mixed feudal population, had fallen to the crown and helped on the unity of France by becoming a part of the royal domain. The Spanish crusade, by two hundred years of warfare, had

gradually forced the Moors from Aragon, Castile, and Leon, into the southern portion of the peninsula and had re-established the Catholic religion in those provinces. This war of conquest was to continue until the Moors were finally driven from Granada and the whole Spanish peninsula unified under Ferdinand and Isabella.

In the crusades royalty was above all the gainer. At first the kings stayed at home and, as a result, gained by not exhausting what power they had in rivalry with vassals that were stronger than themselves. For example, William Rufus went not upon a crusade but remained at home and gave his rapacious nobles aid, strengthening his power. He lent money to his brother Robert to aid him to take the cross, and took for security a mortgage on Normandy which Robert was never able to pay. When the kings had become more powerful as they had by the time of the second crusade, they placed themselves before the world as the great heads and leaders of the movement. By this method they taught the people to regard them with respect as the true lords and rulers of mankind. The French people supplied the great majority of the warriors and their sovereigns were foremost in leading and supporting the crusades. This leadership in the field quite naturally strengthened the royal power and built up the French throne. The ambitious lords who followed the king abroad learned to yield obedience and were little inclined to dispute his authority at home. During the reign of Hugh Capet royal authority was limited to the territory immediately surrounding Paris. During the reign of Louis IX, which saw the close of the crusades, there were ceded to the crown, from various causes, by their feudal lords, the greater part of Toulouse, Chartres, Blois, Sancerre, Macon, Perche, Arles, Farcalquier, Foix, and Cahor. England at the same time surrendered its claim to Normandy, Anjou, Mainz, Touraine, Poitou, and northern Saintonge, so that the territory of the crown was now pretty much the same as modern France. The old-time feudal courts now fell away and an appeal lay from them to the French king. In Germany the case was different. The continuous quarrel between the papacy and the empire weakened the imperial au-

thority in central and southern Europe. Here feudalism kept its hold. The English throne profited to a certain extent in the same way as did that of France, and for the same reasons.

While the growth of royal power was steady, as has been seen, it was mainly at the expense of feudalism as vassals rushed off upon a crusade, mortgaging their holdings to the king, and never returned, or, returning, were too poor to lift the mortgages, the fiefs thus falling to the king. Thus the royal domain continually grew, and with this growth, the extension of sovereign power which ultimately broke up the feudal system and substituted in its stead an absolute monarchy. Many estates thus accruing to the king were granted by him to ordinary freemen who held from him as patron and paid rent in kind. The feudal method of warfare, independent bands of retainers under the command of their feudal lord, proved to be inadequate to cope with the Moslem armies marshalled under one skilled commander. The waste incident to divided authority was so apparent that the feudal nobility themselves recognized it and proceeded to make a study of the military tactics of the Moslems, thus giving rise to modern military methods. This weakened feudalism which was at best local and independent. Again the feudal idea that service flowed only from land ownership, received a hard blow which shook the institution to its foundations. Both knights and barons were glad enough to enroll themselves for pay under the banner of some great chief. The forces of Louis IX were almost wholly recruited in this way. Thus royalty was enabled to make head against the anarchy into which feudalism had forced society, and European national life began to shape itself into form.

As feudalism lost, the cities of Europe gained. These cities were, for the most part, located upon the domain of some lord and were by him taxed in accordance with the terms of the charter held by each city. The burghers made up a non-feudal class and were not subject to military service. When the crusades were set in motion the feudal lord was generally anxious to sell his right over the city upon his domain, and the city was equally anxious to buy its freedom and thus

become its own master. Kings, too, were frequently willing to sell, for ready money, special privileges. Thus cities grew in wealth and population and became the market-places of the world.

While feudalism was falling into ruin and monarchy growing apace, and while free cities were coming up out of feudal bondage, the serf and the villain were also accomplishing something toward their emancipation. When the lord was getting ready to depart upon a crusade he was more anxious to have his purse filled with gold pieces than he was to keep the number of his dependents. He, therefore, sold them their freedom in case they could raise a little money. Many thus became free. Others took the cross and were, consequently, admitted to the position of brothers-in-arms. They became paid soldiers and thus were raised in dignity and power. "The returned knight could no longer disdain intercourse with the brave men whose hamlet nestled beneath his castle walls. Their common courage, their many scenes with which both classes were familiar, the dangers they had shared, were repeated in story and song about the castle gate." Thus were silently germinated the forces of the commune which Louis IX recognized and made use of.

While the crusades, as we have seen, affected organized society in many ways sometimes for evil, more often for good, the institution which was most profoundly affected both to its advantage and disadvantage, was the papacy.

The pope, the clergy, and the monastic institutions, all derived a vast accession of power, influence and wealth from the crusades. Great wealth came to the papacy by means of the many estates which the departing crusaders left in either its possession or trusteeship. Before Godfrey of Bouillon started upon the first crusade he alienated large portions of his ancestral holdings by direct gift to the ecclesiastics. Other lands he left in the hands of the pope and never subsequently claimed them. Many knights returned to their homes broken in health by the hardships of the journey and depressed in spirit with the failure of purpose and the "vanity of life." They ended their days in monasteries which they endowed with the remnant of their estates. The

pope further enriched the papacy by levying a tax upon the secular clergy and religious houses in order to meet the charges of the crusading venture. The vast revenues obtained in this manner were directed from their original purpose and turned into the general uses of the church. The Countess Matilda died, in 1115, and left her entire domain to the pope. The addition to the landed possessions of the papacy amounted to fully one fourth of Italy. To its local property in Italy the papacy held by gifts, escheats, and purchase at least two-fifths of the land through Europe.

In addition to the immense power wielded by reason of this vast wealth, the political power of the pope was greatly extended by the appointment of papal legates. On certain occasions the pope had delegated representatives who, in his name, investigated causes and settled disputes at a distance from the papal court. During the crusades this legatine authority was thoroughly systematized by the organization of a definite body of men. By means of these the pope was impersonated at every court and in every emergency. "This system of being, by proxy, everywhere present gave to the pope a tremendous power and kept the people in awe by the terror of the imagined ubiquity of the divine presence."

But the crusades brought also a quickening of inquiry into every department of human welfare, and a vast increase of knowledge. This intellectual freedom showed itself in the political life of the people. Soon the various governments which had grown strong through the development of monarchy, began to resent the absolutism of the papal throne. In 1253, the Englishman, Robert Grosseteste, protested against the papal exactions in England, though the king was utterly subservient to Rome, and for this protest history has written his name among the great fathers of English liberty. In 1279, England enacted the celebrated statute of Mortmain which forbade the alienation of property to religious bodies without the consent of the government. Similar sentiment was working in France which culminated, in 1298, in open rupture between France and Rome.

With Pope Boniface VIII the papacy was utterly humiliated in a struggle with Philip the Fair of France. The

throne of the papacy was removed to Avignon and the government of the church was dictated by the king of France for nearly seventy years.

With the destruction of papal absolutism there came the renaissance of free thought throughout the entire world. The Moslem forces were not conquered; heresy was not conquered; pagans converted by the sword remained pagans at heart. At last it was brought home to the conscience of the church, by wholesome recollection, the command of the Savior to Peter: "Put up thy sword."

The crusades destroyed the last hope of unity between the Greek and Latin churches. At first the Greeks had looked towards Rome with willing eyes and saw there the possible solution of the difficulties that threatened. But as the crusades went on and they became better acquainted with the hard and cruel warriors from the West, all hope of union vanished and in its stead came hatred and contempt.

So the age of the crusades passed away and with it also passed its faith and its ideals. Says Professor Allen: "The crusades, which the church had stimulated so eagerly and forced on so obstinately, are found to have undermined the very foundation of faith, on which the church reposed. Her doctrine of austere morality, her teaching of a tender humanity, were contrasted against the avalanche of crime she had let loose, the appalling cruelty she had invoked. Her system of doctrine, which looked to the eye like a granite foundation of her spiritual claim, was honeycombed by a thousand speculations set adrift in that sea of adventure. . . . The church by her own act had thrown down the barriers which guarded her domain from invasion of foreign influences; and her undivided spiritual empire was the price she had to pay. The crisis was long in passing. . . . And when the long fever of the crusading period was past, Europe had already been borne into the consciousness of a new, a richer, and a larger life."

## CHAPTER XXIX

### THE CONVERSION OF THE GERMANS

ALTHOUGH the great Germanic nations of Visigoths, Ostrogoths, Burgundians, Vandals, Lombards, Franks, and Anglo-Saxons, with many minor tribes, moved out from the old home and found new ones for themselves inside the boundaries of the Roman empire, still was the old homeland of the Germanic race peopled with tribes of Germans who wandered through their native forests; hunted and fished; cultivated the fields; still worshipped the old German gods, and kept alive the old customs. While their brothers who wandered forth were Christianized and fought under the banner of Christ, they had for the most part never heard His name, but still lived their old free roving life, a source of danger to the more settled and civilized nations about them. Lasting peace was impossible between races on such different bases of culture and so wholly antagonistic to one another in the important matters of life.

The Roman empire had struggled for centuries to subdue the Germans and bring them under the discipline of the empire only at last to suffer defeat at their hand. Christian Rome now undertook to conquer the soul of barbarism itself. This was the magnificent scheme of Leo, of Gregory, and of the English Winfried (Boniface). This thought itself was far-reaching and stupendous in the face of all the empire had striven for and failed to accomplish. Moreover, the means by which this great undertaking was carried out showed a larger political grasp and greater courage than that manifested by the empire at its best estate. The weapons of the new warfare were those of Christian love. The Germans were to be won by way of sympathy and conquered through their religious awe. The men who went out to undertake this great task were animated with a great yearning for the

salvation of these people. They went forth clothed for their task in poverty, austerity, obedience, and self-denial.

The work of converting the Germans in their old home was not fairly begun before the opening of the seventh century. The missionaries who addressed themselves to this task of converting the Germans may be for convenience divided into three classes or groups: (1) the British, (2) the Frankish, and (3) the Anglo-Saxon or English.

The British missionaries who had found for a time such a fruitful field in the conversion of the various tribes of Angles and Saxons in Britain were now cut off from activity in this field as the Roman rule and discipline had been established throughout the island. The religious houses of the Irish and Scotch were full to overflowing and at home there was little for them to do, while they still possessed that zeal for the cause which possessed the heart of St. Patrick. They were now attracted to pagan Germany as a field for labor. The Frankish missionaries enjoyed the favor of the Frankish kings. Sometimes this was an aid to them, as was the case of Clotair I. At other times this kingly aid was merely a new danger because the missionaries were looked upon as spies. Lastly, came the Anglo-Saxons. While the British missionaries were independent of all control, the Anglo-Saxons who had finally been won to the side of the papacy, were earnest in attaching themselves and their converts to Rome. The language of the Anglo-Saxon monks diverged so little from the Low Germans of Frisia that they were able to work with great advantage and could win where the British and Frankish monks, who could not speak or understand the German, could do very little. It was thus naturally settled that the Anglo-Saxons should be the successful missionaries to these peoples.

The Scotch and Irish missionaries were at work in Germany before Augustine had landed on the shores of Kent. Fridolin was preaching among the Alamanni, in 589, Columbanus had made his way along the Danube to the Vosges mountains. Gallus, the pupil of Columbanus, became the Apostle of Switzerland and succeeded in converting these people. The monastery and canton of St. Gall are named

in his honor. Eligius, Amandus, and Willibrod labored with the wild tribes on the Scheldt, and in Flanders and Brabant. These missionaries belonged to the Roman rather than the Celtic group. Behind these people, now partially Christianized, lay populous regions in Frisia, in Hesse, in Thuringia, and in Saxony, into which missionaries had as yet made no entrance. These were warrior races which had never bowed to Roman arts and arms and had scarcely ever heard of Rome's existence.

Thus while a beginning had been made in the more accessible portions, Germany yet lay practically untouched by Christianity when the Englishman Winfried began his great missionary work. He was born near Kirton in Devonshire about the year 680. His father intended him to follow secular pursuits and to be heir and administrator of his large property. But this did not appeal to this spiritual, ambitious boy who from early youth had been studious and religious in disposition. He had, because of this natural leaning, been placed in a monastery at Exeter from which place he was subsequently removed to Winchester. While he was yet a mere boy he gained praise for scholarship and teaching ability. He was looked upon with great favor by Daniel, Bishop of Winchester, to whom the most valuable of his letters were written after he had become famous as a missionary. Like the English generally he was fond of travel and inquisitive concerning the manners and customs of other peoples. He was also attracted by the great opportunities for missionary work which opened up on the continent. Soon, therefore, after his ordination as a priest he left England with a few companions, and went to Frisia where he intended to work. Here he found Willibrod, an English missionary from York who had arrived in Frisia in 687, immediately after Pippin had extended the power of the Franks by winning the battle of Tostry. Willibrod's name had been changed to Clement and he had been consecrated Bishop of Utrecht. But the Frisian king had taken advantage of the disorder following the death of Pippin, to attempt the crushing of Christianity, and stopped the work of missionaries. Boniface went back to England and, in 718, made a fresh start.

He went to Rome where he received the aid and advice of the pope, Gregory II, and a general commission for missionary work in central Europe. Winifried (now known as Boniface) was now 38 years old, having been born in the time of Theodore who had been consecrated and sent to England as Archbishop of Canterbury by pope Vitalian, in 668, four years after the English, at the Council of Whitby, had proclaimed their adherence to the ecclesiastical rites and customs held by the church of Rome. Theodore had confirmed the action of the Council and crystallized the results. He established schools which did away with the previous dependence upon Ireland for intellectual light and religious inspiration. He unified the English church and brought it into harmony with Rome. The diocesan organization prevalent in the Eastern system and which was established by the canons of Chalcedon, was introduced by Theodore into England. The Council of Hertford, where this great work of diocesan systematization was formally adopted and established, had been held in 673, only a few years before the birth of Boniface. He was, therefore, acquainted with this system in its freshness and was educated in one of the schools established by Theodore. It was with the practical working of this system well in mind, and with great respect and deep gratitude and devotion to the Roman see which was felt throughout England at this time, as is seen in the pages of Bede's history, that Boniface presented himself before the pope, in 718, and received his commission.

As soon as he left Rome he went to Bavaria and Thuringia where he attempted to organize and establish the labors of the Irish and early Frankish missionaries, but this brought him little success, and he passed on to Frisia and made his way to Utrecht, the seat of the bishopric of Willibrod. Here he labored for three years as Willibrod's assistant, learning much of the practical work of the missionary from this aged and heroic bishop. Willibrod wished him to stay and offered him a bishopric, but Boniface was restless and desirous of pushing on into new fields. He left the Frisian field and started a new and independent work among the Hessians and Saxons. Here he met with immediate success and in the

following year was summoned to Rome by the pope. He was examined as regards the faith and ordained bishop without any special see, and took the oath that subsequently became so famous and which bound him and his work to permanent unity with Rome. This oath was as follows: "In the names of God the Lord and our Savior Jesus Christ, . . . I, Boniface, by the grace of God; bishop, do promise to thee, blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and to thy vicar, the blessed Gregory, pope, and to his successors . . . that I will maintain the whole faith and purity of the holy Catholic faith and by the help of God will continue in the unity of that faith . . . and that in no way will I agree with anything contrary to the unity of the general and universal church under any persuasion whatever; but, as I have said, I will in every way maintain my faith pure, and my cooperation constantly for thee, and for the benefit of thy church, upon which was bestowed by God the power to bind and to loose, and for thy vicar aforesaid, and for his successors. And whenever I find that the conduct of the presiding officers of the churches contradicts the ancient decrees of the holy fathers, I will have no fellowship or connection with them, but, on the contrary, I will prevent them if I can, and if not, I will report faithfully at once to my apostolic lord. . . . Moreover, this declaration of my oath, I, Boniface, a humble bishop, have written with my own hand, and upon the most holy body of the blessed Peter I have taken the oath as above written, which also I promise to God being my witness and judge." This oath would imply that the work of Boniface was not so much to carry Christianity to people who knew nothing of it, but to organize and unify what had already been done by others, to accomplish for Germany what Theodore had done for England.

It was the lack of discipline and effective organization in the work of the Scotch and Irish missionaries that had rendered their work almost fruitless and introduced discord and corrupt and heretical practices. The increasing power of the bishop of Rome which was revealed in directing, restoring, and consolidating the Christian church, was aided in every way by the support of the Frankish rulers. This was

made effectual by the alliance of the Frankish kingdom with the Roman church. It gave the sword of the Frank to the papacy and furnished both protection and discipline.

The man preeminently fitted for this task of unification and organization was Boniface, the English missionary. He was "endowed with great prudence and foresight, a scholar and a teacher with a rare genius for organization and administration. To him true Christianity was impossible except in union with the papacy. He was determined to make Germany as united and devoted to the pope as England had become. Leaving Rome he went immediately to the court of Charles Martel with letters of recommendation from the pope. Charles gladly took him under his protection and sent him along with his troops among the Hessians. Roman missionaries had preceded him and this made his work more difficult but he finally succeeded in his task. He established among the Franks and their dependents, monasteries and bishoprics as centers of learning and authority wherever there were suitable places. Monks and nuns came over from England as teachers and exemplars of right living among the people. When, in 731, Gregory III became pope the friendly relations with the papacy continued unbroken and, in 732, the pope sent the pallium to Boniface and made him an archbishop or metropolitan and placed him in charge of the northern districts of Germany where he had spent some years of labor, especially in the bishoprics of Tongres, Cologne, Utrecht, Worms, and Spires. In the year 738 he made his last visit to Rome. Here he was invested with the powers and authority of a papal legate, and given a commission to visit the Bavarian church. This he did with very marked success, bringing about a complete organization of the church and establishing the four bishoprics of Salzburg, Freising, Soisson, and Ragensburg or Ratisbon. In 740, he held a synod of the whole Bavarian church in which many important questions were debated and settled. Here he planned the establishment of several new bishoprics in the north; subsequently he carried this plan to completion, creating the bishoprics of Eichstadt, Wurtzburg, Buraburg, and Erfurt.

Charles Martel died in 741, leaving his kingdom to his two

sons Karlman and Pippin. These rulers were better disposed to Rome than was their father who, in his great struggle with the Saracens had taken from the church the vast landed estates which had been bestowed upon it by the Merovingian rulers to the impoverishment of the state. The church in retaliation had opposed Charles in every way it could, thus alienating his good will. The young kings did not feel the resentment of their father and the church, seeing its opportunity, was willing to go more than half way in order to reestablish the oldtime union and sympathy. The work of organization which Boniface had carried on among the Frisians, Hessians, Thuringians, and Bavarians of the north and east, made it more and more essential to organize upon the same pattern the great Kingdom of the Franks, and so to create the dioceses and the synods of this system. The first so-called German synod was held at the request of Karlman, in 742, in order to establish ecclesiastical government throughout his dominions where confusion had reigned for more than seventy years. The acts of this synod were published in the name of Karlman, but Boniface as archbishop and papal legate held the chief position. The work of organization was taken up immediately and new bishoprics created in the chief cities: to the bishops of them the clergy of the district were made subordinate while the newly appointed bishops of the province were made subordinate to the bishop of the chief city or metropolis, who as archbishop or metropolitan was subject to the pope. Thus was completed the organization of the church throughout the Frankish kingdom, on the pattern of Theodosius' organization of the church in England. This may be considered as finished by the middle of the eighth century. Boniface took up his residence at Mainz, in 745, as archbishop. This position he held till 753 when he resigned the office and secured the appointment of Lull, his most distinguished disciple, as his successor. With a band of some fifty companions he now took up again his old missionary labors in Frisia. Here he was murdered by a band of heathens, in 755, and so received the honor of the martyr's crown. His bones finally were put to rest in Fulda.

In 744, but shortly before his settlement at Mainz, Boniface laid the foundations of the monastery at Fulda which was destined to become one of the three great centers of learning in Europe. The other two were St. Gall, founded by Gallus, the disciple of Columbanus, in 646, and Reichenbach, founded, in 724, by Pirminius, a Frankish missionary.

“The Christian zeal of Boniface was unsurpassed. The simplicity of his aims, his earnest anxiety for the very best things for the German church, his lifelong interest in his English home, his wide and living sympathies — all these are reflected in his correspondence. In organizing Germany under the Roman see, he not only followed the drift of the age, but he was doing the best he knew to conserve and consolidate a Christian civilization in an age of anarchy and barbarism. He was a scholar, a civilizer, and a statesman.”

## CHAPTER XXX

### THE CONVERSION OF SCANDINAVIA

THE work of Christianizing Germany was scarcely completed when missionaries began their work in the far north in those lands which were pouring forth swarms of pirates on all the coasts of Europe. Their daring and ceaseless invasions were the terror and, at the same time, the wonder of all the Christianized nations. Palgrave says: "Take a map and color with vermillion the provinces, districts and shores which the Northmen visited as a record of each invasion. The coloring will have to be repeated more than ninety times successively before you arrive at the conclusion of the Carlovingian dynasty. Furthermore, mark by the usual symbol of war, two crossed swords, the localities where battles were fought by or against the pirates; where they were defeated or triumphant, or where they pillaged, burned, destroyed; and the valleys and banks of the Elbe, Rhine, and Moselle, Scheldt, Meuse, Somme, and Seine, Loire, Garonne, and Adone, the island Allier, and all the coasts and coast-lands between estuary and estuary, and the countries between the river streams, will appear bristling as with *chevaux-de-frise*. The strongly fenced Roman cities, the venerated abbeys, and their dependent bourgates, often more flourishing and extensive than the ancient seats of government, the opulent seaports and trading towns, were all equally exposed to the Danish attacks, stunned by the Northmen's approach, subjugated by their fury."

The invasion of these pirates had disturbed the peace of the last years of Charlemagne himself. He had seen their approach with something of an understanding of the danger which they threatened. To meet this danger he planned the building of a great navy, and the erection of strong forts, with garrisons, at the mouths of the rivers. But death re-

moved the only one who understood or had the power to meet the danger threatening from the North. His silly successors utterly neglected these necessary defenses and left the country at their mercy. The Northmen took advantage of this defenceless condition to swarm up every river and waste and burn everything that their fancy cared not to carry off.

Such were the people with whom Christianity had next to do battle.

Willibrod had crossed the Eider, in 636, in his missionary journeys. Harold, king of the Jutes, for political reasons, had sought the protection of the Franks about the same time. Ebo, Archbishop of Rheims, crossed the Eider, in 823, with an imperial embassy. He baptized some Danes and returned in a year with several young Jutes whom he intended to educate as missionaries. These movements paved the way for the missionaries.

In the abbey of Corbey, near Amiens, there was a humble monk belonging to a noble French family, by name, Anschar. He was of gentlest disposition, but of deep and settled piety. It is recorded that when a mere youth a beautiful vision came to him. He suddenly died and at the moment of his death, St. Peter and John the Baptist appeared before him. He was conducted by them to purgatory, where he passed three days in such darkness and suffocation that they seemed a thousand years. He passed on to heaven, whose glory he beheld. A voice of the most exquisite sweetness but so clear that it seemed to fill the world, spoke to him out of the unapproachable light, "Go and return hither crowned with martyrdom." "On this triumphant end, which he gained at last, not by the sword, but by the slow mortification of his life, was thenceforth set the soul of Anschar." (Milman.) Soon after this vision he entered the monastery of Corbey where he remained till the monks of Corbey founded a new monastery on the Weser, west of Paderborn, as an outpost for missionary activities. Of this monastery of New Corbey Anschar was chosen Prior in 822. He began his missionary labors in Schleswig accompanied by Autbert, a man of noble birth, who was led by the enthusiasm of Anschar to become a monk, and afterward to join him in his missionary labors.

Here they founded a boys' school, chiefly by buying Danish slaves and educating them, redeeming Christian prisoners of war, and preaching Christ to the pagans. Anschar does not seem to have made much headway in this missionary attempt. Harold was driven from his throne by his heathen subjects and the missionaries were compelled to flee from the country. But while the door to Denmark was closed for a time, that of Sweden was suddenly opened. Ambassadors from the coast of Sweden to the court of Louis the Pious brought the word that there were some merchants and prisoners in their country who were Christians and who would welcome the visit of missionaries. In 830 Anschar and several companions undertook the mission to Sweden, but were pillaged by pirates on the way. When they arrived at Buka on Lake Malar, the governor of this city was baptized and built, at his own expense, a church for their use. The king gave him full liberty to preach the Gospel as he wished. Here he found many Christian prisoners who were overjoyed to welcome a priest who could administer the sacraments. After the lapse of nearly two years Anschar returned to France and a Frankish monk, Goughert by name, was sent to Sweden as Bishop of Sweden.

In the meantime the archbishopric of Hamburg had been founded and Anschar was elevated to the see which included the northern land. Here a cathedral was built (832) and many more bright Danish boys were brought to be educated for the priesthood. Anschar also sent more priests to Sweden. But the Northmen had as yet learned no respect for Christianity. They surprised and burned Hamburg, cathedral and all. Anschar scarcely escaped, saving nothing but the relics of some saints. The times seemed dark indeed for Christianity. Louis the Pious died in 840. Harold of Denmark detested Christianity and went back to paganism, and uprisings drove out the missionaries and the bishop was compelled to leave the kingdom. This calamity, however, was quickly retrieved. The archbishopric of Hamburg was united to that of Bremen and Anschar was made the archbishop. News now came from Sweden which was encouraging, and Anschar decided to return to that country and take

up again the work of converting their people. He first went to the king with costly presents and invited him to a feast, but the king, although he accepted the presents and attended the feast, was not willing to act without the vote of his people. He called the people together in their parliament and the herald proclaimed the object of the meeting. The people after a spirited debate decided to recognize Christ as one of the gods and Christianity became a permanent religion. The building of churches was permitted and priests were allowed to celebrate the mysteries of the faith. Christianity was now allowed without interruption to push on to the conversion of the kingdom, but it took a hundred and fifty years to complete the work thus begun by Anschar. Knut the Great, after he had united the Christian kingdoms of England and Denmark, sent English priests and bishops to his old home to complete the conversion of his entire continental realm.

Anschar now returned to Denmark and again set up the cross, having been made commissioner to Denmark by Louis the Pious. He gained the confidence of Eric, and his alms-giving and reputation as a worker of miracles produced a great impression on the simple minds of the people. He founded a church at Schleswig, one of the most important towns of Denmark, and, in 896, he built another at Ripe. Under the reign of Eric II (855) the conversion of the people went on so rapidly that complete toleration was granted to the Christians and the nation became nominally a Christian nation.

Anschar was a model of Christianity in his age. During all his life he kept up the rigor of his monkish habit. He wore a hairecloth shirt by night and day. He created a hospital for the sick at Bremen and did much of the nursing himself. He distributed a tenth of his income among the poor and tithed his income afresh every fifth year. He was wont to say: "One miracle I would ask of the Lord, and that is that by his grace he would make me a good man." He died in 865 without having gained his life's wish: that of martyrdom.

Hacon, the son of Harold, the great "unifier of Norway," had been brought up in the Anglo-Saxon court where he had

been trained in the Christian faith. Upon his return to Norway, in 934, he tried to introduce Christianity as the national religion but the turbulent nobility would not consent. After a revolution in government, Olaf Tryggveson became king (955–1000). He had been something of a traveller, and had come into contact with Christian teachers, monks, and others who had made a lasting impression upon him. He visited Ireland where he found many of his own countrymen. This had been Christianized by native monks and priests. Olaf became a Christian while staying at Dublin and was baptized. Shortly after he married the daughter of Olaf Kváran. When he became the ruler of Norway he tried earnestly to convert the nation to Christianity. He finally succeeded by strategy, craft, persuasion, fraud, and even cruelty, in bringing the country to an unwilling obedience to Christ. Tryggveson was a picturesque figure in the history of Norway. He had his heart set on the overthrow of the worship of Odin which had been the worship of his fathers. He used rude and cruel methods in his endeavors at evangelism. He finally stirred up the opposition of his nobility who called in Knut of Denmark to aid them. Olaf was slain in battle, in 1000, and Knut for a time added the kingdom to that of Denmark. Christianity went forward slowly until, in 1035, when Knut was driven out and Magnus the Great was seated on the throne. Christianity became the national faith of Norway. Iceland was also a Norse stronghold, having early been settled by them. In 981 Thorwald and Frederic labored there as missionaries. A council of the island ordered these missionaries to leave in 988. But Doukbrand, a Saxon missionary, took up the work again in 997 and succeeded so well that Christianity was recognized in 1000 as the official religion and in 1016 the whole island was Christianized. Iceland was colonized in 986 by Northmen from Ireland. They were converted to the Christian faith in 1000, thus completing the work of missionaries in the great northwest territories.

If we examine closely the characteristics of the Germans, which have now been passed in rapid review before our eyes, the most striking of all will appear to be the intense indi-

vidualism and passion for *personal independence* which dominated each member of the race. This feeling of *personal*, as distinct from political or corporate independence, was unknown to the Romans and antiquity generally. In fact the Roman was so utterly void of this element that he necessarily failed of comprehending the *personal* element in Christianity and satisfied his soul with forms and ceremonies. It was the German who brought the passion for personal independence into the national society of that day and, like new wine in old bottles, it quickly proved too strong for its Roman environment. After this spirit of liberty had destroyed the empire the Germanic peoples assimilated in some measure the principles of liberty derived from the Gospel and became the fountain of modern society. The conversion of the great Germanic races is the certain prophecy of the Reformation.

## CHAPTER XXXI

### THE SLAVS

THE principal representatives of the Slavonic tribes in modern Europe are the Russians, with the various Polish nationalities, the Servians, the Hungarian Slovaks, the Slavs of the Austrian empire, such as the Illyrians, Styrians, Corinthians, and the Tcheks of Bohemia. A large infusion of Slavonic blood has also taken place among the modern Greeks. The name Slav is from "Slava," a term in their language meaning "speech" or "tongue," and is a term to distinguish the persons of their own race from "foreigners" who could not speak their language. When they first came into touch with Latins they were called Veneti which was but a Latin corruption of the Greek Henetoi. The Germans called them Wenden (Wends). They called themselves Serbi or Servi, a name which has been preserved by their modern descendants, the Servians. Caesar tells us of Veneti on the Atlantic sea-board, where, doubtless, they were mingled with Celtic tribes. Other Veneti settled beside the northern angle of the Adriatic, in a district where afterwards arose the beautiful and glorious city of Venice. But we are more concerned to determine their locality in the fourth century after Christ, when in combination with members of the Turanian stock they broke in upon the Roman frontier. A vast triangular space between the Baltic and the Black Sea, having its apex at the Carpathian Mountains, and for its base a very indefinite line, bisecting European Russia from northwest to southeast, may serve to indicate in general terms the situation of the Slavonic tribes at this era. But being hard pressed by the Teutonic populations on one side and the wild nomads of Asia, the Bulgarians, Avars, and Huns, upon the other, they did not succeed in establishing free nationalities of their own but were placed in subjection to their

neighbors. After the death of Attila, being released from bondage to the Huns by the disruption of their empire, and neglected by the Germans who were pouring over the Balkans and the Alps, they acquired some degree of independence and formed an alliance with the Huns, and with the Bulgarians, against the Greek empire. Of the Slavs themselves we may for convenience give their divisions or principal branches. The most eastern were the Antes, who stretched over the Euxine, and extended into the country between the Don and the Dnieper. This division is the parent of the great Russian people. The western group were Veneti or Wends who rested upon the Baltic and marched to the Carpathian Mountains. It is with this great portion of the Slavonic family that the Greeks and the Romans were acquainted. Between these groups were the Slovens or Slavones, who appear to have possessed organization and racial cohesion more than the other two, and are found mingled sometimes with the eastern and sometimes with the western branch in their migrations and enterprises.

The personal and social characteristics of the Slavs distinguished them from the Teuton. Procopius describes them as "an unclean race dwelling in miserable hovels of mud and reeds, which were scattered at rare intervals among impervious forests and morasses; they lived a life of promiscuous intercourse, and were either entirely naked, without dress, or clad themselves in the skins of beasts, or a suit of dark tissue woven by the women, from which the nation derived a particular name. They are said to have smeared their bodies with soot, and to have eaten the flesh of all sorts of animals, even the most noisome and disgusting. They possessed in large degree the virtues of hospitality, exhibiting these to the stranger; they were distinguished for the veracity and good faith which marks the actions of the Bedouin of the desert under similar circumstances. In war they were treacherous and cruel. Armed with long lances, a bow and a quiver of poisoned arrows, the Slavonic warrior stole warily upon his enemy and slew him from ambush. . . . His moral and religious instincts were of the lowest kind. Of marriage he had no notion; his worship was a fetishism of the

ordinary sort practiced among savages, mingled with sorcery. They believed in the existence of a Good and Evil Being but worshipped only the Evil in order to propitiate him." Thus Procopius sketches the Slavs. As he was an enemy doubtless he has exaggerated. They were, generally speaking, sallow-skinned, with long, lank, dark hair, and small, deep-set eyes, of firmly-formed frames, though not exhibiting the stalwart chest and shoulder which marks the Teuton and the Celt. The cunning in all species of deception, ambuscade, and stratagem of which Procopius speaks is still discernible in the national character and has also its more favorable developments in productive skill, and a very remarkable faculty of imitation. Their courage is more passive than active in its character. This has been demonstrated in the various European wars in which they have taken a part.

The Slavs were very largely made tributary by Attila and followed his banner and fought in all his wars. But when Attila died his empire quickly went to pieces and in the great battle of Netad the Ostrogoths overthrew the Huns and the subject nations were set free. But this freedom availed little and for one hundred years we hear almost nothing from them. Then they are associated with that non-Slavic, but Turanian horde, the Bulgarians, in their descent upon the Eastern empire. Belisarius, the famous general of Justinian, administered a crushing defeat upon these invaders. They engaged in a long struggle with the Franks under Dagobert, in 631, where they were at least partially successful, until their leader, Samo, died. Then their scattered tribes broke from their loose federation and sought separate settlements. Croats and Serbs settled in Moesia and Dalmatia. Others became tributary to Charlemagne. Of these the Czeks of Bohemia were the most conspicuous. Many Slavic tribes were settled on the borders of the Baltic and rose to some consideration, from their commerce and extensive marts at Arkona, Kiel, and Novgorod. They long continued pagans.

In the conversion of the Slavs to Christianity we must first consider that Turanian race, the Bulgarians, who, after

their defeat by Belisarius, settled along the Danubian frontier of the Eastern empire. They give us an example of an act very rare in history. They, although generally victors, abandoned their own language and customs and adopted those of the Slavs among whom they settled, or close to whom they lived along the course of the lower Danube and on the shores of the Black Sea. Their Asiatic home was on the banks of the Volga. For three centuries no impression was made on either the Bulgarians or the Slavs who occupied the northeastern frontier of the empire. These people were still rude, warlike, and chiefly pastoral; alike inaccessible to civilization and the religion of Rome. The Greek empire was strangely slack in its efforts to spread the Christian faith, and the East had no Pippin or Charlemagne to compel the pagans to accept Christianity. The first establishment of Christianity among the Bulgarians took place in the ninth century. The sister of Bogoris, the king of the Bulgarians, had fallen in her childhood into the hands of the Greek emperor. She had been a captive for thirty years, and had been educated at Constantinople in the Christian faith. A monk, Theodosius Cupardo, had been long a bond slave in Bulgaria. To avert war between the Bulgarians and the Eastern empire an exchange of prisoners was considered, the king's sister for the pious monk. The king was moved by the pleading of his sister and he listened to the arguments for Christianity. Meantime a plague broke out and ravaged the country. Bogoris turned to Christ and the plague was quickly stayed. To complete the work of conversion two monks were sent from Constantinople, sons of Leo of Thessalonica, distinguished for learning and zeal, Cyril and Methodius by name. Cyril was familiar with the Greek, Latin, Slavonian, Armenian, and Khazorian languages. Methodius was an artist of great skill in painting. These monks worked zealously for the conversion of the people. The painting of the Judgment won their king, but did not influence the people. The nobles turned against the king and threatened revolution but the king finally succeeded in winning the people to Christianity. An appeal was made to the pope and an effort was made to bind Bulgaria to

the papacy, but after long years of strife, influenced by the emperor, Basilius, the Bulgarians attached themselves firmly to the Greek church.

Cyril and Methodius, after working for a time in Bulgaria, went on to Moravia. They reduced the language of the Slavs to writing, conducted the services of the church in the native tongue of the people and translated the Scriptures in Slavic. In 868, Methodius was made archbishop of Moravia. In 908, the Moravian kingdom was overthrown by the Magyars, a horde of Asiatic barbarians, and out of its ruins arose Bohemia and Hungary. In these nations Christianity, after a long struggle with paganism, finally triumphed through the influence of their princes, Boleslaus II (967) and Stephen (997–1038). The churches of these countries submitted to Rome. From Bohemia the Gospel was carried to Poland where it became the state religion under the jurisdiction of Rome. Attempts had frequently been made by the Franks to subjugate the Wends — Slavic tribes dwelling to the north and east of Germany — and to convert them to Christianity, but all attempts had failed for various reasons. In 1047, Gottschalk, a Wendish chief, having united all the Slavic tribes under his rule, rebuilt all the churches which had been destroyed during war, and endeavored to found permanent Christian institutions. But his people were not ready for such a change and they rose against him and he fell a victim to his own zeal, and with his death his people returned to paganism. War followed and they were nearly exterminated and German colonists were settled in their territory.

While the conversion of the Slavic tribes had been progressing, as given above, Russia had received Christianity from the East. This was brought about, as was the conversion of Hungary and Bohemia, by the action of their King Vladimir (988). He was converted by the spectacular account of the magnificence and impressiveness of the ritual of the church of St. Sophia at Constantinople, given by his ambassadors when they returned from a political mission. The Scriptures, as translated by Cyril and Methodius, were at hand and the king made use of these to impress his people

with their truth. From this beginning Christianity became the state religion of the Russian empire.

In the twelfth century Christianity was carried to the Pomeranians, a Slavonic tribe closely related to the Poles, and subsequently made tributary to them. When missionaries at first visited them they were looked upon with contempt as they were clothed in worn priestly garb and were emaciated by fasting. But when, later, the Bishop of Bemberg, Otto, who was a friend of the emperor, Henry IV, went among them dressed in his episcopal robes and supported by the authority of Poland, he made a profound impression. When, in addition to this, he manifested a spirit of unselfish devotion to the cause of Christ, the Pomeranians were gradually won over to the new faith. As we come to the age of the Crusades the war-like spirit was dominant and the slow method of evangelization seemed irksome and tedious. The method of the Turk seemed to please better. Out of the crusading enthusiasm of the twelfth century there sprang an order of knights, called "Brethren of the Sword." By their military valor Livonia was subjugated and its new bishoprics protected. The population was compelled to accept Christianity. Prussia was Christianized in the same manner. "The Teutonic knights," a military order which sprang out of the circumstances of the crusades, conquered the country and forced the people to accept Christianity. Large portions of the territory were confiscated and German colonists were settled among the conquered Slavs. These intermarried and have given us the strange example of a hybrid race, not more than half German, setting up as preeminently the representative of the great German people. Christianity by the sword has not proved over successful.

## FOURTH PERIOD

---

FROM GREGORY THE GREAT TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE PAPAL AUTOCRACY

590–1250

---

### BOOK VII

THE EMPIRE AND THE PAPACY



## CHAPTER XXXII

### THEORIES OF UNIVERSAL GOVERNMENT

**I**N the consideration of feudalism in Chapter XXVII, we found that form of government did not discover the secret of social organization. It only proved another vain attempt of society to right itself without beginning with the proper unit, the common man. It nevertheless made one move in advance, as it brought the governing power a step nearer and, by differentiation, made a thousand kings instead of one. This did not introduce economy in government and was, no doubt, wasteful in the extreme, but it did elevate many men to participation in government and in this way made the political education of the masses possible. During the prevalence of feudalism we discovered four elements of society in continuous and irreconcilable conflict. These were (1) the common people or non-feudal class, (2) the feudal class, (3) the emperor, and (4) the pope.

The common people or non-feudal class was merely a survival of the old city population of Rome. When the barbarians swarmed over the Roman frontier and began their work of destruction and settlement, they shunned the cities and took up their residence upon the hills in the neighboring forests, thus continuing their lives in accordance with their ancient custom. City life was entirely new to them and they were afraid of the enclosing walls and narrow streets and deemed that devils lurked about in the dark and stuffy alleys. They overthrew the government and destroyed or dispossessed the agricultural population, but they left those dwelling in the cities pretty much to themselves. The development of feudalism affected the German population and brought about a revolution in the relationship between the old tribal leader and his followers, but it did not very seriously affect the population in the towns and cities. When

the invasions had spent themselves, and life had once more settled down to its accustomed channels, the dwellers in the towns and cities came out of their hiding places, rebuilt the breaches in their walls, and took up again their usual occupations. They, robbed of all agricultural pursuits, now gave their whole attention to commerce and manufactures, supplying the needs of the feudal population that surrounded them. Their numbers were increased from time to time by the inflowing of the country dwellers, who grew tired of the steadily increasing exactions of their feudal lords and sought refuge among the artisans of the towns. The second element of feudal society, the old German population, had settled down to agricultural pursuits, leaving behind them their old-time roving spirit. The war leader has become a feudal lord while his followers have become villains, settled upon the lord's domain and bound to him by the oath of fealty. This originally constituted a class of society one step higher than ordinary citizens or freemen, with interests which were deemed in conflict with the latter, and protected by contract with the lord of the fief, but as time went on these villains became degraded by the growth of oppression into a condition little better than that of slavery. They entered into a struggle for political independence which lasted for centuries and which was destined finally to bring about a complete revolution in society. The free population of the cities had also to struggle for their rights both with the feudal lords, the emperor, and the pope. Their conflict became merged with that of the lower class of feudal society and the two were destined to march on together to the winning of common rights and privileges.

The emperor and the pope represented the widest authority. Originally they represented different fields of activity, but ultimately each claimed to be the sole heir to the imperial power of the Roman empire. Thus a rivalry sprang up between them which finally opened the way of escape to the common people from their lords and developed the Third Estate which was destined, in the fulness of time, to overthrow both pope and emperor.

In the centuries which succeeded Charles the Great two

radically antagonistic theories concerning the nature of empire were developed. These two theories were formed about the rival heads which were during that time contending for control, and were known respectively as the State-Church and Church-State theories. Briefly outlined these theories are as follows:

## THE STATE-CHURCH THEORY

While this theory was centuries old it was first formally set forth by the poet, Dante, in his *De Monarchia* (1310-1313). In this work the poet seeks to prove from Homer, Aristotle, Juvenal, Ovid, Lucien, and the Psalms of David, the following hypotheses:

(a) The rule of the world belongs of right to the Roman people. He demonstrates this from the fact that Rome had succeeded in establishing her authority throughout the known world and had given a better form of government than any other nation had succeeded in forming. But this was in reality God's government as, from the very nature of the case, all government comes from Him.

(b) The emperor, Augustus, as heir of the Roman people, and their legitimate representative, ruled by reason of this divine right. Dante claimed that such an empire as this was indispensable to the welfare of human society and that the authority which it made use of was directly from God, and not derived in any way whatever from the pope. It was the one responsible mediator of the corporate interests of humanity, itself a revelation of the divine spirit. The church was merely the imperial organ for moral and spiritual work. The empire was conceived of as incapable of cessation and as unbroken from Augustus. It, therefore, antedated Christianity and took it up unto itself.

(c) When the Western empire fell, this divine right to rule was vested in the emperors of the East, they being the legal representatives of Augustus.

(d) When Irene usurped the power which legally belonged to her son, the right to rule again vested in the *populus Romanus*. This necessarily carried the seat of government

back again to Rome, which had lost its preeminent position when Constantine established his capital at Constantinople.

(e) This divine right to rule passed to Charles the Great through the medium of the pope who for the time represented the *populus Romanus*, he being elected by that body and so exercising merely delegated authority.

(f) When the Carolingian line failed, this right again passed back to the *populus Romanus* where it belonged, and where it remained till, through the mediation of the pope, Otto the Great received it in 962. It thus continued to rest in the German emperors until the time when Dante wrote.

#### THE CHURCH-STATE OR PAPAL THEORY

This theory was originated or at least fully developed by Augustine, in his *City of God*. Thence it worked its way to the sub-consciousness of the church and afterwards found a place in the formulae of the canon law. Augustine's theory was the exact reverse of the one set forth by Dante. It made the church supreme, God's sole institute and agent for working human welfare. The state was merely its functionary and made use of as a noble instrument. And yet it was impossible for the empire to be anything else than degraded, in practice, by the prevalence of such a theory. Innocent III (1198–1216) set forth this latter theory in a terse and classic form in the following words: "The Creator has fixed in the firmament of the church universal two dignitaries. The greater, the papacy, governs souls as the sun by day. The less, the empire, governs bodies as the moon by night." The theory which was thus admirably voiced by Innocent was very much strengthened by the issue of the Pseudo-Isadorean Decretals (840–860), a collection of Apostolic Canons, spurious decretals of the popes from Clement I to Melchiades, arranged in chronological order, with brief regulations regarding processes against bishops. These were arranged and published by an ecclesiastic of southern France. It was at first supposed that this compilation was produced to favor the pope. Investigation, however, shows that it was in favor of the bishops and was

doubtless prepared to protect them from the oppression of temporal princes and the restraining acts of ecclesiastical councils. The authorities here collected supported the right of an appeal to the pope in every process where a bishop was concerned, and to make the permission of the pope a necessary preliminary to the summoning of a provincial ecclesiastical council. As between pope and king, or pope and emperor, these decretals threw the weight of their authority on the side of the pope.

With the radical difference as to theories of function set forth above, no sane person would look for long-continued harmony of action between these two powers. The question which had to be settled was: "Who shall remain master of the world, the heir of St. Paul, or the heir of Augustus and Charles the Great?" The struggle for mastery between these two rival authorities lasts through two stormy centuries and is naturally divided into three parts or acts: (1) The War of Investitures; (2) The Revolt of the Italian States; and (3) The Triumph of the Papacy.

## CHAPTER XXXIII

### THE WAR OF INVESTITURES

THE coronation of Charles the Great was not performed in accordance with any ancient precedent or legal right, but was justified by the circumstances of the moment and the unanimous action of all those concerned in it. The purposes of both empire and church were being carried out in equal degree. The precise relations existing between pope and emperor were never defined, but it is certain that Charles would never have admitted the extravagant claims that the popes subsequently set up. He was always certain that his power was supreme in both state and church and throughout his life he acted upon that hypothesis. Of the two powers that swayed Christendom he was without any doubt the greater, and his will was everywhere supreme. The councils which were summoned throughout his vast empire were ecclesiastical synods no less than national diets, and he legislated for both church and state with equal absolutism. So long as he lived the influence of his masterful mind was everywhere felt. When he died and his empire was partitioned among his sons a change was inevitable, but it came slowly. Louis, the weak but pious son of the great emperor, had been upon the throne for sixteen years before the break actually came. The later Carolingians caused the empire to become a mere legal fiction. Its crown was sometimes worn by a lord of the West Franks and sometimes by a lord of the East Franks, while its power was never greater than the personal prowess of its wearer. That vast empire that had been built with so much energy and wisdom was divided up among the sons and grandsons of Louis, and the century was filled with strife between these and their descendants. Internally the empire was harassed by incessant struggles between rival kings, dukes, bishops, and abbots,

each striving to increase his own power at the expense of another. Disruption and decay were discoverable on every side, but were more pronounced in Italy than north of the Alps. This fair land was broken up into innumerable lordships which were continually at war with one another. The city of Rome was ruled, sometimes by a pope, sometimes by the people, but more often by some fierce nobles of the neighborhood who took upon themselves the titles of consuls and patricians. Each one of these warring powers struggled in turn for the prize of the crown of Lombardy.

The direct line of Charles the Great in Germany came to an end in 911, and the old elective principle which had held from the first among the Germans, now came to the front and Conrad of Franconia was chosen as king, and after him, Henry of Saxony, the father of Otto I. Otto was by far the ablest king who had arisen in Germany since Charles the Great. He quickly suppressed disorder and rebellion throughout his kingdom, and then gave his attention to the barbarian invaders that threatened from the east. He overthrew the Magyars in the bloody battle of the Lichfeld and conquered the remnants of Lombard power in northern Italy. Having thus completed the overthrow of threatening enemies from without, and consolidated his kingdom by crushing internal opposition, he accepted the invitation of Pope John XII and, in 962, visited the city of Rome. Here he freed the city from the tyranny of nobles and as a reward for his services had bestowed upon him the imperial crown which had been held in abeyance since the last of the Carolingian line had passed into the grave. Again was that bond between Germany and Italy which had been established by Pippin and Charles made fast by Otto. By this act the independence of Italy was indefinitely postponed and the Holy Roman Empire established. This was to represent in purely German hands the sway of the great Augustus, and the whole Christian world was to be henceforth theoretically subject to it. Otto the Great ruled with as much vigor in Italy as he did in his possessions beyond the Alps. He also asserted his authority in the church with as much assurance as did Charles the Great. He overthrew the rebellious Ital-

ian lords. He deposed John XII, who had invited him to Rome, and placed the papal crown on the head of Leo VIII in his stead. He made the Roman people swear to elect no pontiff in the future whom he had not first approved. He thus went far toward the establishment of the principles for which Charles the Great had contended. Otto III followed in the footsteps of his renowned grandsire and controlled the church with a high hand. As he was unable to find Italians who were fitted to occupy the papal chair, by reason of their licentiousness and ignorance, he nominated Germans to the Holy See. He first nominated Bruno, his kinsman, to that office. Bruno took the title of Gregory V and gave promise of being a most worthy pope, but died soon after assuming office. Otto next nominated the pious, eloquent and learned Gerbert, who assumed the title of Sylvester II. Otto III dreamed once more of making Rome the imperial capital, but all his wonderful plans were cut short by his untimely death at the early age of twenty-two. Thus the direct line of the Ottos came to an end in 1002. He was followed by Henry II (1002–1004) and Conrad II (1024–1034), but these kings were compelled to give their time to the settling of difficulties in Germany, and so left Italy and Rome to themselves. Henry II had great plans for reforming the church and strengthening the empire in every direction, but they were never carried out by reason of his early death. During the reign of Henry and that of his successor, Conrad, the popes were usually nominated, not by the emperor, as was the case with Charles the Great and Otto, but by the counts of Tusculum, who sold the dignity to the highest bidder, and as a consequence the church sank into the lowest depths of ignominy and corruption. Henry III strengthened the imperial claim to the authority in both church and state, but he died in 1056 when yet a young man and scarcely at the height of his power, leaving his work all unfinished. Pope Victor II, who had been nominated to the office by Henry, and who himself was a German, was appointed guardian of Henry's infant son and administrator of the empire. Victor was a champion of the State-Church theory and there appeared some danger of the complete

absorption of the papacy by the empire, when the pope suddenly died only one year after his friend and patron. Now it was that the political disintegration of the empire set in and went on apace during the long minority of Henry IV.

The church, adopting the views which were partially developed by Augustine, taught that God designed to found a Kingdom of Heaven upon earth, and that governments were usurpations unless they were subordinate to this main purpose of creation. This teaching seemed harmless enough and, indeed, had much of truth within it, but as the centuries went by "the hierarchy became more and more convinced that the Kingdom of Heaven on earth meant the Kingdom of the Pope." Feudalism had, however, demoralized the church beyond the hope of enforcing any such belief upon the world by absorbing it into its own decentralizing system. Finally one-fifth of France was held by the church in feudal tenure. One-third of Germany was held by it in the same way. These territories were ruled by archbishops, bishops, and abbots, who had become invested with the rights of dukes and counts, and exercised these rights as suzerains or overlords over the entire population. But for them to exercise these rights and privileges they must first be invested with them as proprietors of the fief to which these were attached. This investiture depended wholly upon their taking the oath of fealty to the secular lord or king. In this way through the instrumentality of feudalism, the emperor became overlord of all ecclesiastics whom he *invested*, not only in the ordinary manner as his vassals, but also with ring and staff, the emblems of their spiritual office. As time went by the worldly wealth and influence of the clergy increased, while the prelates became feudal beneficiaries. They disobeyed the old imperial laws which forbade the clergy engaging in military occupations, and rode to war with all the pomp of military chieftains. Rich bishoprics and abbeys became the objects of ambition to greedy competitors, and the king or the emperor was frequently tempted, for service or money, to bestow these upon unworthy candidates. In this way ambitious and unscrupulous men, ignorant of the teachings

of the Bible and the services of the church, became bishops and abbots, and, as such, though not knowing how to read, were influential in the councils of the church. At this time the clergy were very generally married and there was a tendency to transmit clerical benefices to some of the clergymen, in this manner creating an ecclesiastical aristocracy or caste, which resented the elevation of men of humble birth and tended preeminently to alienate church property. Had this continued unabated it would have resulted in the complete localization of the clergy and the divisions of the church would have followed the divisions of the empire and the centralizing influence of the papacy would have been completely broken down. This secularization of the clergy prevailed for more than two hundred years and was the chief weakening power in the north. The church had become more demoralized in Italy than it had in Germany and France. Here the lust for money and power, concubinage, and simony were universal, and the papacy itself was carried away by the general corruption. Pope Nicholas I (858-876) had carried the papal claims to the highest point that they had thus far reached, and in bringing this about had made use, for the first time, of the famous False Decretals of Isidor. He sternly prohibited the divorce of King Lothair from his queen, again assumed authority over the prelates of Germany and Gaul that had been yielded by some of his predecessors, and forced recognition of the papal supremacy. But this high plane of authority was not maintained save for a brief period, and was followed by a century of weakness and darkness that was almost profound. During this period the papal throne was won by every species of violence and intrigue. For fifty years it was practically owned and controlled by three profligate women who formed a league with the licentious nobles of Tusculum and plundered the church far and near. These nobles finally brought the papacy to its lowest depths of degradation by seating a twelve-year-old boy on its throne with the title of Benedict IX. As he grew to manhood, Benedict led a life of the most shameful depravity, turning the Vatican into a den of thieves and prostitutes. Bands of cut-throats roamed the

streets of the city and pillaged pilgrims who came to the holy sanctuary, dividing their ill-gotten gains with the pope in return for his protection. Benedict finally grew tired of playing pope and wished to reform and marry his cousin. After having squandered the vast revenues of the church in shameful practices he finally sold the office to the arch-presbyter, John Gratian, a man of immense wealth, but upright character, who assumed the title of Gregory VI. Contrary to the rules of the church a vast number of the priests were married and openly defied their superiors to discipline them. Corruption was so far-reaching and powerful, with a profligate pope at the head of the system, that the enforcement of the rules of the church was impossible.

The church, however, had not lost all sense of decency and righteousness. Occasionally strenuous efforts to reform were put forth, but these for the most part came from without. Thus Otto the Great took up the task and deposed John XII for simony and gross malfeasance in office, but it was Henry III who recognized the imperative duty of a far-reaching reformation. He was a thoroughly upright and religious sovereign who strove to check simony and other corruptions in the church. When Benedict IX sold the papacy to John Gratian, the new pope went to work with energy to reform its worst evils. He was a man of personal purity who, prior to his elevation to the papacy, had belonged to a party of reformers in Rome who were disciples of the school of Cluny. He claimed that he had purchased the papacy from Benedict with the sole purpose of bringing about needed reforms and his actions bore out his words. He built and repaired churches from his private revenues and put a stop to the plundering and robbery that was giving to the sacred city the name of "a den of robbers and murderers." He further restored the property of the holy see which had been lost by means of violence and fraud. But these reforms did not suit the rapacious appetites of the Tuseulum nobles who had been the chief beneficiaries of the old rapacity. They brought back the profligate Benedict IX, who had by now gotten away with the purchase price, on the ground of the illegality of the sale and the impossi-

bility of Benedict divesting himself of the sacred office in any such way. Previous to the sale a faction had arisen in the city which drove Benedict out and set up a new pope under the name of Sylvester III. With the return of Benedict there appeared three claimants for the papacy, each one occupying a portion of the city: Benedict held the Lateran; Gregory, Ste. Maria; and Sylvester, St. Peter's. At last the scandal and confusion of all this became intolerable and Henry III was appealed to. He immediately set out for Rome, crossing the Alps and entering Pavia on October 25th, 1046. Here he was received with great honor by the Marquis of Tuscany and other nobles. He immediately issued a summons for a great synod to be held at Sutri, a small city some thirty miles to the north of Rome. Here Gregory presided and the claim of Sylvester was immediately taken up and passed upon. He was convicted of simony, deposed from the papacy, degraded from the priesthood, and condemned to retire into a monastery. Gregory, without awaiting a formal accusation, acknowledged with frankness that he had purchased the papal throne from Benedict and was unfit for the office. But he pleaded, in partial extenuation, that he had purchased the office only to reform it and for the best welfare of the church. Claiming that his conscience now troubled him, he tore off the pontifical robes, and descended from the chair. This self-condemnation was immediately ratified by the council. Benedict was summoned to Sutri but he did not see fit to obey. Henry, therefore, immediately proceeded to Rome where he entered without any opposition and summoned a second synod to be held at St. Peter's in December. Benedict IX was now formally deposed from the high office and the capital of Christendom purged of all pretenders and the throne of St. Peter left vacant. Henry III was a disciple of the doctrine of thoroughness and believed that the right place to begin the reformation of the church was at its head. He despaired of being able to find an Italian clergyman fit for the papal office because of the degeneracy of all Italy. He, therefore, nominated Suidgar, bishop of Bamberg, a German prelate of unblemished life and unquestioned piety, to the exalted posi-

tion. But that prelate did not wish to desert his bishopric for the higher duties and responsibilities of the Roman see, and was only reluctantly persuaded by the insistence of Henry who led him to the papal chair amid the acclamations of the entire people. Suidgar took the title of Clement II and immediately took up the task of reformation to which he was pledged. "Those who were convicted of buying or selling sacred offices were to be punished with excommunication; clerics who had been ordained by bishops whom they knew to be simonical were to be subjected to penance and suspended from office for forty days." These were the decrees which were enacted by a synod held in January, 1047.

Henry was called back to Germany by a rebellion which had broken out north of the Alps under the leadership of Godfrey, Duke of Lotharingia. While Henry was engaged in putting down the rebellion news was brought to him of the death of Clement, who died October 9th, 1047, only a year after his elevation. Henry nominated Beppo, bishop of Brixen and a native of Bavaria, to the vacant seat, and directed Boniface, marquis of Tuscany, to conduct the candidate to Rome where he was consecrated in St. Peter's on July 17th, 1048, under the title of Damasus II. But he could not endure the heat of Rome and died within a month of his coronation. Henry was once more called upon to fill the vacancy and this time he nominated Bruno, bishop of Toul, for the position. He could not have found a better man had he spent a year in the search. After three days spent in fasting and prayer, Bruno finally yielded a reluctant consent, but he made one stipulation, that the emperor's choice should be ratified by the free choice of the Roman clergy and people. Until this had been secured he utterly refused to assume the pontifical state. He spent two months on the journey from Worms where he was when the emperor nominated him to Rome. On the way the waters of the rivers receded before him as did that of the Red Sea before the children of Israel, and when he prayed voices of angels were heard to make answer and many and various were the miracles performed by him. He walked barefooted to the gate of the city and asked the Romans if they would receive him

in the name of Christ. When he reached St. Peter's, he declared as he did upon setting out, that he would return to his bishopric unless he should receive the dignity of the papacy by the unanimous voice of the people. On the 12th day of February, 1049, he was enthroned as Leo IX, the decree of his election having been drawn up in the name of the clergy and the people.

Like his predecessor, Leo was committed to the work of reform. His task was a gigantic one, however, possibly only half realized by him when he assumed the office. In spite of all the efforts at reform made by Otto the Great and Henry III, as well as all the popes who preceded Leo, the life and habits of the clergy were unspeakably vile. The monstrous wickedness of Pope John XII and Benedict IX was by no means uncommon among the clergymen. They have been chosen simply because of their prominence. Social purity was almost unknown, and simony, which according to ecclesiastical law is the greatest of all crimes, was nearly universal. This name was derived from the story of Simon Magus, in the 8th chapter of Acts. He it was who offered money to the apostles for the gift of the Holy Ghost. The laying on of hands of the bishop was supposed to impart the holy spirit, and, consequently, the buying and selling of ordination to any office in the church was regarded as simony. In the course of time this term was extended to cover traffic in ecclesiastical affairs and in the rights of ecclesiastical patronage, and to the purchase of admission to monastic orders. Primitive usage required a candidate for an episcopal vacancy to be elected by the clergy and people of the diocese and that election to be approved by the metropolitan bishop and his assistants. Charles the Great and his successors conferred bishoprics by direct nomination or by commendatory letters to the electors who were not deemed sufficiently independent to depart from the choice thus indicated by the emperor. Later it became customary to grant the honors and estates of a see only upon liberal payments on the part of the recipients. The power of the nomination and investiture in this way became an instrument of the grossest rapacity, and church offices were bestowed upon the highest bidder with-

out regard to character. Leo also had a great problem in the domestic relations of the clergy. From the first celibacy had been enjoined upon the western clergy, but the prohibition of marriage was confined to the simple letter of the canon law. The secular clergy kept women in their houses in the relation of the Roman law, and paid a tax called *cullagium* for the privilege. The early church fathers did not forbid marriage, but recommended celibacy as a matter of choice. At the close of the third century bishops and abbots were permitted to retain wives whom they had married before ordination, but not to marry after they were in orders. The first absolute command to the higher clergy to observe celibacy was in the decretal of Pope Siricus, in 385, which applied to bishops, priests and deacons. The reforms undertaken by the Carolingians accomplished but little. The enlarged power of the papacy only added to the increasing license of the times. At last the policy of the papacy demanded, as a matter of self-preservation, that the priesthood should be bound absolutely to itself, and that the sacerdotal order should be separated from the rest of society, and from common sympathies, interests and affections. The marriage of priests had become so common in the tenth century that Routharis, an Italian bishop, declared that all his clergy were married and that if he were to enforce the canon prohibiting marriage none but boys would be left in the church. Leo decided to cut asunder the domestic tie and remove from holy orders all persons who persisted in keeping wives. To accomplish his reforms he summoned a council at Rheims, in 1049. One of its first acts was to declare that "The pope alone had the right to be called the Apostolic Primate of the Church Universal." Twelve canons were passed for the better ordering of the church. "These canons forbade simony, and enjoined freedom of election by clergy and people to ecclesiastical offices; the clergy were forbidden to marry or to bear arms, or take any fees for burials, baptism, the administration of the eucharist, or visitation of the sick. The practice of usury, the plundering of the poor and of pilgrims, and marriage within the prohibited degrees were all forbidden."

Leo consumed his time in efforts at reform and constant journeys between Italy and Germany. He was wise in the choice of his advisers, surrounding himself with able men who were in hearty sympathy with his plans, and were of a temper kindred to his own. Prominent among these was Peter Damiani, abbot of Fontanella in Umbria, "a man who combined the superstitiousness of his age and order with liberal education, trained amid the austereities of a hermit's life, unpractical and timid in his dealings with men, but candid, pure in morals, inspired with horror and detestation of the foul abominations of monastic and clerical life, and portraying them in terms which, if not choice or classical, were unmistakable." Along with him was Hildebrand, whom the pope had already made sub-deacon, and soon afterwards appointed superior of the monastery of St. Paul. This man was indeed already the inspiring spirit of the time. As soon as the council at Rheims had completed its work the pope turned his attention to the political conditions of the state. This move on his part brought him into immediate conflict with the Lombard and Norman nobles in the south of Italy. In 1016, the city of Salerno was saved from destruction by a Saracen fleet by a small band of Normans on their way home from a pilgrimage to Palestine. These sea-rovers fell in love with this south-land and from this time on a stream of Norman adventurers flowed into southern Italy. It was but a part of the great movement of the Northmen from Scandinavia and the Danish peninsula which took place in the ninth and tenth centuries. Bands of these hardy warriors had settled in France, Ireland, England, and Russia. Those passing to the south took part with the Greeks in a struggle with the Saracens for the possession of Sicily, in 1039, but as their services were but poorly requited they gave their attention to the conquest of Apulia in their own behalf. They were able to conquer both Apulia and Calabria in short order and took and fortified the town of Aversa. Their title to this territory was made good by a grant from the duke of Naples, in 1029, to their leader, Robert Guiscard. Guiscard entered into an alliance with the Lombard princes about him and immediately became a menace to

both the papacy and the empire. Guiscard succeeded in establishing a strong power which Henry III recognized, giving him also a portion of Benevento. When Leo turned his attention to the political problems of Italy, the Norman princes were ruling respectively at Salerno, Calabria, and Benevento. Leo thought that Benevento legitimately belonged to the church, and upheld the people in disregarding both Norman and Lombard claims and placing themselves in his protection. He appointed two princes to rule in his name, but the Normans slew these and resumed the government. The pope now appealed to the German emperor for aid to make good his claim against the Normans. He was, however, only able to secure a few hundred mercenaries under the command of Godfrey of Lorraine and his brother Frederick. The pope placed himself at the head of these forces and marched against the Normans, in the meantime excommunicating them. The Normans joined battle with the pope's troops near a little town called Dragonata on the bank of the river Fertoris, and utterly destroyed them, taking the pope a prisoner. But the Normans, though barbarians, were good churchmen and treated the pope with great consideration. They finally released him upon the receipt of a great ransom and their investiture with the territories of Apulia, Calabria and Sicily as fiefs of the papacy. After an absence of nine months in an honorable captivity in Benevento Leo returned to Rome much weakened by sickness and humiliation over his defeat. He died upon the 13th day of April, 1054, in the fiftieth year of his age.

The death of Leo IX was a very critical period in the history of both papacy and empire. After careful consideration and a vain effort to convince Hildebrand that it was his duty to accept the nomination, Gebhard, the bishop of Eichstadt, who was one of the wealthiest and ablest German prelates, was elevated to the honor of the Roman see, and inaugurated at Rome on the 13th day of April, 1055, just one year from the death of Leo. He took the title of Victor II. The emperor with a large army accompanied the new pope into Italy. New troubles quickly arose. Boniface, the Margrave of Tuscany, had been murdered some three

years before, leaving a widow, Beatrix, and three minor children. Two of these children died shortly after their father, leaving only Mathilde, a girl eight years of age. Two years after the death of Boniface, his widow married Godfrey, the duke of Lorraine, who had taken part with Leo in the unhappy struggle with the Normans. Godfrey was a bitter enemy of Henry III and was now a foe to be reckoned with as he, by his marriage, had obtained control of Tuscany and all the other vast possessions of his wife. In case he formed an alliance with the growing Norman power in the south, he would have all Italy at his back and could dispose of the papacy as he saw fit and obtain for himself the imperial crown. Henry recognized the danger and acted with his accustomed energy. He marched to Florence where Beatrix and Mathilde resided, and seized them as hostages for the good conduct of Godfrey, and carried them with him into Germany. Godfrey hastened to Lorraine and stirred up a dangerous revolt against Henry, which was scarcely put down when the emperor suddenly died at the early age of thirty-nine, October 5th, 1056, only a few days after receiving the new pope at Goslar. He was buried on his birthday, October 18, beside his noble parents in the Cathedral church at Speier, and his young son Henry, scarce six years old, was conducted to Aachen and crowned by the pope. The empire reached the height of its power under the strong and righteous rule of Henry III, but the church saw in his untimely death its own delivery from imperial dictation.

Before the death of Henry III he had made terms with Godfrey and allowed him to take possession of his duchy and the rich inheritance of his wife in Tuscany. Upon his death, the empress, Agnes, was made regent for her young son, while Pope Victor II acted as suzerain of both the papacy and the empire. After spending Christmas with the young king at Regensburg, the pope returned to Italy where he celebrated Easter at Rome. Once more the summer heat of the Eternal City was too much for a German pope. On the 28th of July, Victor II died of a fever at Arezzo. He was but thirty-nine years of age and was a man of great activity and physical vigor, giving promise of a long life

of usefulness to both church and state. Frederic, the brother of Godfrey, and now ordained abbot of Monte Cassino, was elevated to the Roman See and took the name of Stephen IX. He undertook to carry forward the reforms which had been undertaken by his predecessors. He issued a brief against simony and intrusted the promulgation of the same to Humbert, the cardinal-bishop of Sylvia Candida, whom he made arch-chancellor of the papacy. Humbert was the author of a treatise on simony in which he denounced lay investiture as the chief source of the evil. In this he was in a measure right. With the true spirit of a monk, he claimed that it was degrading and infamous in the extreme, that the ring and the staff, the symbols of spiritual office, should be bestowed by female hands, as they now were by the empress, Agnes. This position threatened the amicable relations which had heretofore existed between the papacy and the empire, and the pope sent Hildebrand off to Germany to smooth things over and to obtain the sanction of Agnes to the election of the pope. His mission was successful and Stephen was duly recognized. The pope now undertook to rid Italy of the Norman invaders, a task in which Leo had so signally failed. He started for the southland with this purpose in view when he fell ill at Monte Cassino. He hastened to Florence, the residence of his brother Godfrey, but turned aside to the village of Vallambrosa where he died in 1058. He was the fifth pope furnished by Germany since Clement II. They were generally looked upon with suspicion by the Germans as they were thought to have become Italianized by their residence in Rome. They were generally hated by the Italians, as the common people looked upon them as foreigners, while the clergy and Tuscan nobility hated them because of their attempted reforms. But they had been sustained by the strong arm of the empire, and their conduct had been uniformly a model of uprightness and modesty.

The empire was in the hands of a weak woman and Hildebrand was absent in Germany when the pope died. The various factions of the opposition now concluded that the time was ripe for having a pope of their own choosing and,

although Stephen had pronounced anathema upon any who attempted to elect his successor until Hildebrand should arrive at Rome, the temptation was too great to be resisted. The counts of Tusculum and Galicia, together with the sons of Crescencius of Monticello and their partisans, secured the city and the papal palaces with troops and placed John Mincius, bishop of Velletri, a Roman belonging to a noble Italian family, on the papal throne, compelling a priest of Ostia to consecrate him at night with the title of Benedict X. Peter Damiani and other friends of the late pope fled for safety from the city. It was at this juncture that Hildebrand returned from Germany and, so soon as he had been acquainted with the facts, halted for a time at Florence and thought out a plan of action. He saw the danger to all his cherished reforms should the Italian nobles succeed in their irregular election. He finally succeeded in obtaining the rejection of Benedict by the empress and obtained authority from her to proceed to a new election. Godfrey of Lorraine promised him the necessary force to expel the usurping pope, as he was himself a reformer and heartily in sympathy with the aims of Hildebrand. The latter now placed in nomination Gerhard, bishop of Florence, a Burgundian by birth, and well known at the court of Henry III as an upright and holy man. He was, like his German predecessors, a champion of reform, and a man of vigorous intellect and wide learning. Godfrey furnished the troops and Hildebrand the money to secure the success of the enterprise. The cardinals and clergy were reassembled at Siena and elected Gerhard pope on the 28th of December. A synod which was immediately summoned at Sutri, pronounced a decree of deposition against Benedict and excommunicated him. Benedict fled to Galicia where he was besieged by the troops of Godfrey and took refuge in the church of Santa Maria Maggiore. He finally fell into the hands of Hildebrand who carried him before Nicholas and a council in the Lateran. Here the robes of office were placed upon him, after which he was tried, condemned, and the robes stripped off before the altar. He was finally deposed from all spiritual offices and sent into

the monastery of St. Agnes where he lived on for more than twenty years.

Gerhard was consecrated in St. Peter's on the 25th day of January and took the name of Nicholas II. His pontificate is mainly remembered by the establishment of two great foundations of papal power; one was the formal alliance with the Normans which henceforth gave the swords of these fierce warriors to the service of St. Peter; the other was a decree passed immediately after his election at a great Lateran council concerning the election of a pope and which was the greatest revolution attempted in the hierarchy since the days of the apostles. "The council enacted that on the death of a pope the cardinal-bishops should first assemble and nominate a successor; they should then summon the cardinal-priests to vote upon their choice; and finally the people should be consulted and give their consent." The right of the emperor to confirm this choice was recognized in rather vague terms. This ran as follows: "Saving due honor and reverence to Henry, at this present time king, and destined, as it is hoped, to be emperor by the favor of God, even as we have granted this right to him and his successors, as many as shall personally obtain it from the apostolic see." By the further act of this council, the Roman clergy were to have a prerogative right to the papedom. In case a fit person could not be found within the church of Rome, any stranger was to be eligible. In case the election could not be held inside the city, it might be held by the cardinals, clergy, and "representatives of the faithful laity in any place which the cardinals might deem convenient."

The council which adopted the new method of electing a pope was far the largest that had ever met in the Lateran. One hundred and thirteen arch-bishops were present together with a multitude of the lower clergy. But though large, it was not representative of western Christendom as three-fourths of the total number were Italians while the remainder came from Burgundy in France. Germany, which was the big end of the empire, had not one single representative present and could not be criticized for being unwilling to recog-

nize as binding the action of such a one-sided council as that. This election decree which was entrusted to the keeping of Norman swords was unpopular in both Italy and Germany. In Italy there were many nobles of German descent who held their titles from the empire and so sided with Germany. There were also Latin nobles from the empire who were unwilling to recognize the sovereignty of the pope. The city of Rome was split into two parties, a papal and an imperial, while there was a large number of turbulent nobles who were unwilling to recognize either party but wished unmolested to continue their pillaging and robbery. The pope was compelled to support his authority with Roman soldiers. Thus all the elements of the revolution were present when, on the 27th of July, 1061, Nicholas II died. His death furnished the excuse as well as the occasion for political upheaval.

The enemies of reform now thought that the time for independent action had arrived. They claimed that the election of Nicholas II had been irregular, and no doubt it was. They also claimed that the new scheme of election was a direct violation of all precedents. The same might truthfully be said of all reforms. They held a parliament at which they conferred the patriciate upon the young King Henry, sent him the insignia of his office and asked him to nominate a new pope that would be favorable to them. These conservatives were joined by the bishops of Lombardy and envoys from the city of Milan who urged the empress to use her influence with her son to nominate a Lombard pope who would be an enemy of clerical celibacy. It must be remembered that the clergy of Milan were very influential both on account of their numbers and their wealth. They were, in large majority, married and were, consequently, opposed to the reform decrees. A distinct party was thus organized siding with the empress and opposed to reform.

While the conservative party was thus organizing in Lombardy, and gathering all their friends in Rome to oppose Hildebrand and elect a pope to their liking, the reformers were not idle. They first sent Cardinal Stephen on a vain mission to win the boy emperor. The German bishops held

a synod at which they declared the acts of the Lateran council void. Thereupon Hildebrand summoned the cardinals, in accordance with the Lateran decree, on the first of October, 1061, and elected Anselm, bishop of Lucca, a Lombard and intimate friend of Hildebrand, as pope under the title of Alexander II. A crowd of monks bore him on their shoulders in triumph through the city, while a strong force of Norman soldiers protected him from any assault which could be made by the imperial partisans.

This one-sided election of Alexander was looked upon by the Germans as a high-handed invasion of their rights, while the Lombard ecclesiastics saw in it the hand of the cunning Hildebrand and dreaded new reforms. These now joined with the German bishops under the leadership of Guibert of Ravenna, in an assembly at Basle, in October, and elected Cadalus, bishop of Parma, as pope, under the name of Honorius II. Cadalus was a weak and vacillating man, in no way fitted to enter into a contest with such a man as Hildebrand, but he had plenty of money and he knew how and where to use it. Damiani, the official vilifier of the party of Hildebrand, represented him as a man without character or learning but such partisan vituperation must be taken at its worth. Two popes now confronted each other, chosen by hostile parties and representing opposing principles. The one was resident in Rome, the other beyond the Alps. Each now proceeded to prepare with zeal for the conflict. To this universal interest attached because it was thoroughly understood that the struggle now on was not simply between two rival popes, but rather between the papacy and the empire.

Alexander was a weak man but he had back of him the most forceful character of the age, Hildebrand, whom he immediately appointed as chancellor and who furnished him with brains. He also had Peter Damiani, the fiery monk, who pelted the opposing candidate with such vigorous expressions as, "the devil's preacher," "the apostle of Anti-christ," "food for hell fire," and similar phrases which, though elegant epithets, were scarcely Christian in sentiment. In the company of these men and a large body of followers Alexander made a triumphant journey through

the streets of Rome, protected by Norman soldiers. But Cadalus was not idle. He did not believe that he was an impostor and usurper as Damiani had said. He did not even believe that he was "food for hell fire." He had been the imperial chancellor of the rugged Henry III and was a courtier of high standing. He, moreover, had what the Roman populace was ever greedy for. He, therefore, started for Italy with confidence, in the spring of 1062, and was conducted by the imperialist party from city to city with great display. His party halted at Parma and completed arrangements for the descent upon Rome.

While the opposing popes were thus getting ready for the conflict the city of Rome was far from quiet. The imperial party within the city gathered beneath the banner of Benzo, the bishop of Albi in Piedmont. He was a man of considerable eloquence and not devoid of wit. He had been appointed to the office of commissioner of the empress Agnes to the Romans, and his name and office had attracted to him the discontented nobles and prelates throughout Italy. Benzo first formed an Honorian party in Tuscany and afterwards went to Rome where he was received with high honor. He summoned an assembly of all the adherents of Honorius in the Circus Maximus where a Gothic king had held the last chariot race seen in the city of Rome. The arena was overgrown with grass and weeds, but the seats were still in good repair. This assembly took on such a popular appearance, as if the whole city were present, that Alexander attended in person. Benzo denounced the pope in an harangue that reminded one of Damiani. He called him "a perjured traitor to the German court, who had abandoned his see of Lucca and usurped that of Rome; as an intruder who had obtained his election by bribery and the aid of Norman robbers; he proclaimed Hildebrand as the prime mover in the business, for which they both had incurred damnation. He exhorted him to abdicate the chair of St. Peter and seek forgiveness of Henry." Alexander only took time to deny the charge against him and rode off amid the hoots and cat-calls of the populace. While Benzo was carrying on his campaign for Honorius in Rome that

pope was journeying from Parma southward in company with Guibert. He pitched his tents at Monte Maria and there awaited the forces that Hildebrand had hastily gathered together for the support of Alexander. In the battle which took place Honorius was completely victorious, leaving the battlefield strewn with the bodies of his enemies. He entered the Leonine gate of the city on the 14th of April and here his progress came to an end and he was unable either to advance or retreat. In the meantime Godfrey of Lorraine was approaching with a large army from the north. He encamped before the walls of the city, but abstained from interfering and settling the dispute by force of arms. Both Alexander and Honorius appealed to Godfrey but he commanded each to return to his bishopric, leaving the decision to the arbitrament of the emperor. They finally consented to do this. A decision was finally given in favor of Alexander, no doubt, through the influence of Hildebrand.

Alexander, being finally recognized and seated, occupied the papal throne for twelve years. The purpose for which Hildebrand had been struggling for a quarter of a century was practically accomplished during this reign, and the claim of the crown to interfere in papal elections was effectively met. The Romans finally grew tired of the claims of Honorius and, after a year spent in St. Angelo, he purchased the privilege of retiring to the northern part of Italy with the sum of three hundred pounds of silver. A council held at Mantua, in 1064, upheld the decision of the emperor and declared Alexander to be the lawful pope and formally deposed Cadalus, who now retired to Parma where he lived on for several years, still laying claim to the papal throne but giving no further trouble. Very little of importance was accomplished in the subsequent years of Alexander's reign. He was unable to contend successfully with all the warring forces arrayed against him. His strong friend and champion, Godfrey, died in 1072, thus weakening his power of control. A great festival, the most brilliant ever held in Italy, was celebrated at Monte Cassino in the consecration of the famous new basilica. The pope and Hildebrand were present as well as throngs of Norman counts and

Lombard princes. The festival lasted eight days and celebrated the friendly alliance which had taken place between Rome and the Normans. It actually menaced the imperial theory of government and strengthened the hands of the pope. Soon after its close, on April 21, 1073, Alexander II died. Hildebrand, who had been the real head and controlling power of the papacy for a quarter of a century, succeeded to the office as Gregory VII.

Church and empire have been thus far sparring for position. It is now possible to discover the trend of events and to see well on toward the end. With these twin pretenders to universal empire in the condition indicated, the empire received a new champion in the son of Henry IV, a lad but six years old when his illustrious father died in 1056. He was but twenty-three when the church chose to the chair of St. Peter her most renowned son, Hildebrand, as Gregory VII.

While Hildebrand had been so faithfully building up the church into a strong central power, the German kingdom had been continually growing weaker through the long minority of Henry IV. A powerful and able man could not have harmonized its many warring factions, its lords, its dukes, its counts, and its margraves, jealous of each other and perpetually struggling for precedence, without all the skill he possessed. It was an impossible task for a weak woman like Agnes. She was thoroughly religious and her intentions were good, but she had no will of her own and harkened first to one counsellor and then to another without any definite or fixed plan. Her favorites were chosen because of personal attachment and not by reason of their wisdom or uprightness of character. Gold or favor was the only road to a hearing at the German court. The principal counsellor of the empress was Henry, bishop of Augsburg, a man of large experience and upright character. From the position which he held at court he was looked upon with hatred and envy, and all manner of baseless and slanderous stories were circulated concerning his conduct with Agnes. The nobility were indignant because a woman controlled in all the affairs of state through the instrumentality of a man

whom they despised. They declared that the young king was being educated under female influence, and was not instructed in manly studies or chivalrous sports. Such a person, they said, would be unfit to take his place with men of parts and carry on the affairs of state or lead in times of war. The nobility generally wished to see Henry separated from the influences about him and put into training suited for his high position. When the young king had reached the age of twelve years, a plot was formed by the leaders of the malcontents to get him away from court and surround him with more wholesome influences. The empress and her son, in company with the bishop of Augsburg, spent the early part of the year at Goslar, a town in Saxony. Early in March they journeyed to the famous old town of Paderborn and, on Easter, attended a festival at Utrecht. After the festival they went with a small band of followers to a palace on the Rhine at a town now known as Kaisersworth, where a banquet was given in honor of the empress and her son. Bishop Anno, who was present, took occasion to praise the beauty of a barge belonging to him and at that time lying in the stream. He invited the young prince Henry to go on board and examine it. This the young prince did. So soon as he mounted the deck, however, the oarsmen, at a given signal, pushed off up the stream toward Cöln. When Henry discovered that he was being carried off, he jumped overboard and attempted to swim to shore but was overtaken by Count Fobert and taken back to the barge which then proceeded on a leisurely journey to Cöln where the young king was placed in the care of Anno. The empress was soon reconciled to the bishop and consented to have her son in his charge. This high-handed act brought about a complete change of policy on the part of the empire. The party of reform headed by Hildebrand hailed the conspirators as friends and an assembly of nobles held at Cöln decided that the guardianship of the young king and the administration of imperial affairs should devolve upon the bishop in whose diocese the king was held. Bishop Anno thus became not only the guardian of the king but also assumed the duties which had till now devolved upon the

empress-mother. Agnes now retired to Rome and gave herself entirely to religion, resigning all interference with politics.

The council which met at Mantua in 1066, and recognized Alexander II and deposed Cadalus, divided the guardianship of the king and the administration of imperial affairs between Anno, archbishop of Cöln, and Adalbert, archbishop of Bremen. This was an unhappy arrangement in every way as these two men were opposite in character and had nothing in common. Anno was a man of humble birth, affable to his inferiors but haughty to men of rank. Adalbert was a man of high birth, harsh and overbearing to men of low degree, but prodigal in his gifts to those who flattered him; a thorough courtier with a genuine reverence for royalty. He became, naturally, the favorite guardian of the young king who looked upon him as a pleasing and indulgent friend. Anno was thoroughly disliked by his pupil as he lacked the graciousness of his colleague and had rather the temper of a despotie schoolmaster. Neither one of these guardians could be considered as a wise guide to youth, and they utterly failed to fulfill the wish of those who separated him from his mother in order to have him trained in the duties of state and manly sports of the time. He was never taught self-control, but humoured in everything. Anno was severe in rebuking the minor evils in the young prince, but granted him no part and furnished him no instruction in the weighty matters of church and state. Adalbert allowed him absolutely free rein in the indulgence of his tastes and passions, but did put forth some little effort to instruct him in diplomacy and statecraft. In this way the young king grew to manhood, vacillating in temper, licentious in habits, impatient of control, and utterly untrained in all those things which were necessary for a young prince to know. At the age of fifteen he was girded with a sword. This was the token that he was henceforth to assume the active conduct of government. The days of guardianship were past. This impressive ceremony was performed at Worms, March 29th, 1065, Duke Godfrey of Lotharingia carrying his shield and Eberhard, archbishop of Trier, binding his sword upon

him. In the following year Henry was married to Bertha to whom he had been betrothed by his father when he was a little child. Milman gives the following admirable sketch of the young king at this time:

“The emperor was a youth with all the disadvantages of youth, the passions and weaknesses of a boy born to empire, but with none of the adventitious and romantic interests which might attach the generous to his cause. He had been educated, if education it might be called, by a gentle mother, by imperious churchmen who had galled him with all that was humiliating, with none of the beneficial effects of severe control. They had only been indulgent to his amusements; they had not trained him in the duties of his station, or the knowledge of the affairs of men. In his earliest youth thus altogether undisciplined, he had been compelled to contract a marriage for which he felt profound aversion; and the stern churchmen who had bound this burden upon him refused to release him. He tried to bribe Siegfried of Mentz to sanction the divorce, by promising his aid in despoiling the abbots of Fulda and Herzfeld of the tithes of Thuringia; but the pope sent the stern Peter Damiani to forbid the evil example. ‘Well then,’ said Henry, ‘I will bear the burden which I cannot throw off,’ and when, no doubt in consequence, he plunged with reckless impetuosity into the licentiousness which his station could command, this unexcused, unpalliated, was turned to his shame and discredit by his inexorable adversaries. At length, indeed, his generous nature revolted at his ill-treatment of a gentle and patient wife. . . . Thus with all the lofty titles, the pomp without the power, the burden with nothing but the enervating luxuries, none of the lofty self-confidence of one born and fitly trained to empire, the character of Henry was still further debased by the shame of perpetual defeat and humiliation. His great qualities, till they were forced out by adversity, his high abilities, till gradually refined and ripened by use and experience, were equally unsuspected by his partisans and his enemies.”

While the German kingdom was being weakened and its glory lost by the many evils incident to a long minority,

Hildebrand had been consolidating the papal power in Italy. He had labored with some success to establish terms of amity between the Lombards and the papacy. He had bound Beatrix and her daughter Mathilde of Tuscany to the church in such bonds of love and veneration that they could never be broken, thus securing vast domains to the support of the church. He had established a strong alliance with the Normans in Apulia so that their swords were placed at the command of the papacy. He had striven everywhere to advance the claims of the papacy over the temporal powers of Christendom. His aims were at least partially accomplished before his own elevation. The people both north and south had been taught to respect the papal power. "The great body of Christians in the west would no more have thought of discussing the character of the pope than the attributes of God. He was to them the apostle, the vice-regent of God, enveloped in the same kind of awful majesty. They feared the thunders of the Lateran as those of heaven. Their general belief in the judgment to come was not more deeply rooted than in the right of the clergy, to anticipate, to declare, or to ratify their doom." Every qualification requisite to a pope of dominating power and supreme fitness for the office met in Gregory VII. He had both virtue and piety, each in large degree; the fame of vast theologic knowledge and breadth of scholarship; the tried ability to rule men; courage which took pleasure in confronting the most powerful and overcoming them; a stern singleness of purpose which, cloaked under the name of churchmanship, gave reliance and confidence to his partisans. To all these qualifications he added a subtle policy which bordered upon craft. To them his very faults were virtues. No act of his could be wrong. Vincent says of him: "Nature endowed him with an indomitable will, a restless energy, a dauntless courage, a clear conception, an imperious temper, an instinct of leadership, and an intellect of superior power and grasp. His education intensified his native powers by narrowing their range. He was trained to rule in the school of implicit obedience. He was the child of the Roman Church, inspired from childhood with the highest ideas of its pre-

rogatives, and reared under conditions which developed knowledge of men, self-restraint, persistence and diplomatic subtlety. . . . He was above the moral level of his age only on the side of the grosser vices. . . . His ideas of veracity, justice and charity were those of a secular mediaeval despot. . . . His nature was stern and inflexible, and his bearing haughty and insolent." Hildebrand was born in Savon, a little village near the town of Soana in Tuscany. Being located in close proximity to the marshes his native town was frequently swept by fever and so kept continually in the clutches of direful poverty. His father's name was Bonizo; but little is known of him save that he was a laborer engaged in the lowly occupation of a goatherd. Some effort has been put forth to connect him with the noble family of the Aldobrandini, but this has grown from the fact of his naming his son Hildebrand. It is certain that the boy had influential relatives in Rome. His mother had a brother who was abbot of St. Mary's on the Aventine and because of his position held the third place among the twenty abbots who assisted the pope in the celebration of the mass. Hildebrand was sent to this monastery by his parents at a very early age and educated with many other boys, some of noble birth. It was at this kindly home where he acquired his peculiar veneration for the Virgin Mary that verged upon actual idolatry. St. Mary's was the home of the abbot of Cluny whenever he paid a visit to Rome. It was also the retreat of Laurentius, the learned bishop of Amalfi, and of many other earnest men who were animated by the spirit of reform. Here Hildebrand received careful training in the use of Latin, the rules of rhetoric and dialectics, and in the writings of the fathers. He breathed the atmosphere of churchliness in every hour of his life, while on every hand were continual reminders of the great antiquity of the city and the venerable authority of St. Peter. He himself stated in later life that "St. Peter had nourished him from infancy beneath his wings, and had fostered him in the lap of his clemency." Very early he made his profession as a monk and went to Cluny where he passed several years in the severe discipline of the Benedictines. Subsequently he took

service as a subdeacon under John Gratian who was at that time arch-presbyter of the church of St. Giovanni by the Latin gate. When Hildebrand was but twenty-five years old his patron became pope and chose him as his chaplain. It will be remembered that Gratian was the man who bought the papacy from Benedict IX and himself assumed the title of Gregory VI. There is no evidence that Hildebrand did not approve of this transaction. Certain it is that he aided his patron in every way possible and pushed forward his reforms. When Gregory was deposed and accompanied the emperor to Germany, Hildebrand went along. We are possessed of a description given of him at this time: "A young man of small stature and ungainly figure, feeble voice, dull of complexion, but with a bright and piercing eye, bespeaking a fiery spirit, and a mind of restless activity and uncommon penetration."

The activity of Hildebrand from the time he came into public notice as the chaplain of Gregory VI, in 1045, till his own elevation to the papacy, in 1073, has already been briefly sketched. He now devoted himself with untiring energy to the organization of the Christian world as a state over which the pope should preside. This mighty design involved four specific purposes:

(1) To wrest from the emperor the privilege of nominating the popes, and so, to emancipate the papacy from all dependence upon the empire.

(2) As a means to this end, he desired to purify the church itself.

(3) To wrest from all nobles the privilege of nominating to ecclesiastical office of any grade, and thereby to emancipate the whole church from control by the feudal lords.

(4) To establish the supremacy of the papacy over all temporal powers.

This was, indeed, a program calling for gigantic powers and even Hildebrand hesitated for a moment on the brink. In a letter which he wrote to Duke Godfrey shortly after his consecration which took place June 29th, 1073, he described himself as overwhelmed by the prospect which lay before him; that he would "rather have died and been at rest in

Christ than to live on in the midst of such perils; nothing but trust in God and the prayers of good men could save him from sinking beneath the load of anxiety; for the world was lying in wickedness; all men and especially they who held high office in the church, in the thirst for gain and the glory of this world, were disturbers rather than defenders of the church, the enemies rather than the friends of religion and justice." But however sorrowful he may have been, he took up the burden of his office without hesitancy and with his old-time determination and perseverance. The Normans in the south were already becoming restless and dissatisfied. Their leader, Robert Guiscard, appeared to be ill disposed toward the new pope. Gregory set out immediately to the south, and finally succeeded in making a new treaty with Landulf of Benevento, and also with Richard of Capua. These leaders undertook to defend the person of the pope and the property of the Holy See and never to invest any one with a church benefice without the sanction of the pope. This treaty entered into with the rivals of Guiscard angered the Norman leader and he proceeded to ravage the territory of Capua and Benevento. Gregory solemnly excommunicated him in a synod which was held at Rome in 1074.

After three months spent in the south the pope returned to Rome and began a correspondence with Henry IV, thinking that he might adjust matters at the German court and himself assume the mastery over the king. Events had in the meantime been playing into his hands as the Saxons had broken into open revolt because Henry had, at the instigation of Adalbert, created numerous fortresses throughout Saxony and placed in them garrisons for the purpose of holding the people in check. The Saxons sprang to arms under the leadership of Otto of Nordheim, laid siege to the castles and caused the prelates that were friendly to the king to flee. They intercepted and confiscated the revenues of the crown and had persuaded the Thuringians to join them in rebellion. Henry was now driven by events to write a letter to the pope confessing and bewailing his sins, promising amendment and professing submission to the Holy See in language the most meek and contrite. Gregory com-

manded the king to form a truce with the Saxons and submit the decision of the contest to the papal legate. Henry wanted nothing of the kind; least of all he wished the interference of the pope in the struggle as he deemed the matter wholly within his own jurisdiction. He decided to make terms with the Saxons himself and so sent an embassy to their camp and entered into an agreement to withdraw the garrisons from the castles which had been erected by him. This was satisfactory to the Saxons but the order was too slowly carried out to suit them. The castle of Hartzburg, which had been built with great care, refused to open its gates. To adjust this difficulty Henry summoned a diet of the German princes upon the 10th of March, 1074, but this was too late to suit the Saxons. A force of 80,000 insurgents tore down the castle and the church hard by, dug up the foundations and looted everything worth carrying off. Henry again appealed to the pope to censure the rebels for their cruelty and sacrilege.

But Gregory saw his own plans being carried out by the enemies of Henry and so did nothing but send him a few soothing words. His mind was occupied with his great plan for the suppression of lay investitures and to accomplish this he summoned his first great reform synod at the Lateran on the 13th of March, 1074. The German bishops failed to attend and refused to acknowledge the validity of the synod. But this did not deter Gregory. The synod enacted that those who had obtained their churches by simony should be compelled to surrender them; that married clergy should not be allowed to perform clerical functions. Robert Guiscard, the Norman leader, who was at that time besieging Benevento, was anathematized together with all his followers, and Philip I of France was threatened with excommunication. The synod proceeded no farther at this time, but the decrees which they passed were not received with much favor either in France, Germany, England, or Lombardy. These nations were still further angered by the sternness and violence shown by Gregory in the enforcement of them. Germany was the first to stir the wrath of the pope by conspiring with Guibert, the archbishop of Ra-

venna, who championed the cause of the clergy of Milan, most of whom were married, to set at naught the decrees of the synod. He declared in a letter to Henry that self-seeking men were attempting to create distrust between himself and the king. He next strove to bring the north of Europe more completely under control. He wrote to the king of Denmark his expectation of receiving delegates from him to adjust ecclesiastical matters and to take the proper steps for the establishment of a metropolitan see in Denmark. In the following year he made arrangements for a second great synod to be held in the Lateran to take into consideration the whole question of lay investiture. The practice of investiture rested, from its origin, on the principle that the ruler of a country had the right to appoint bishops within his realm. In Germany this right was championed most earnestly because the bishoprics and abbeys in that country had become almost entirely political organizations, the same as any other fiefs. They coined money, received toll, and exercised criminal and civil jurisdiction. They furnished their military complements, and it was a common sight to see a bishop or abbot with buckler and sword mounted on a charger and leading his troops in battle. Upon the death of a bishop the ring and the staff, which were the emblems of his office, were brought to the king who kept them in his possession until a successor was appointed. The new bishop who had been chosen was put in possession of the temporalities of his fief by the ceremony of investing him with the ring and staff, and receiving from him the oath of fealty. This ceremony was gone through before he was consecrated. It was customary for the newly invested bishop or abbot to make large and costly presents to the king. This put them all, in the eyes of Gregory, under the charge of simony.

The second Lateran synod which the pope now convened had in reality but one object before them, although they did re-enact the decrees against simony and clerical marriage which had been passed in the previous years. They took into consideration the question of lay investitures and decreed that investitures by laymen with any ecclesiastical

office was absolutely uncanonical. This was far-reaching in the extreme and touched in a vital point the royal power in Germany and Italy as this right was claimed, and justly too, as one of the most powerful prerogatives of the empire. According to this decree every bishop or abbot who should receive investiture from a layman should be deposed from his office and interdicted from all communion with the church until he should abandon the benefice which he had received. But it did not stop at this point. It enacted the punishment of deposition from office of any emperor or other secular potentate who should take it upon himself to invest an ecclesiastic with a fief of the church. The enactment of this celebrated decree opened the War of the Investitures. Thus Gregory gave the watchword for one hundred years of struggle between the church and the secular powers. "This statute," says Milman, "made a revolution of the whole feudal system throughout Europe as regarded the relation of the church now dominant, to the state. In the empire it annulled the precarious power of the sovereign over almost half his subjects. All the great prelates and abbots, who were at the same time the princes, the nobles, the counsellors, the leaders in the diets and national assemblies, became, to a great degree, independent of the crown; the emperor had no concern, unless indirectly, in their promotion, no power over their degradation. Their lands and estates were as inviolable as their person. Every benefice, on the other hand, thus dissevered from the crown, was held, if not directly, yet at the pleasure of the pope. For as with him was the sole judgment (the laity being excluded) as to the validity of the election, with him was the decision by what offenses they might be forfeited; and as the estates and endowments were inalienable and were withdrawn from the national property and became that of the church and of God, the pope might be, in fact, liege Lord, temporal and spiritual, of half the world."

In the gigantic struggle that was now on it was not merely the patronage nor even the purity of the church which was at stake. It was simply the question: "Shall pope or emperor be the supreme ruler in Europe?"

For some time after the synod Gregory occupied himself in carrying out its decrees and trying to establish the papal supremacy in Hungary, where he had been called to mediate between King Solomon and his rival, Gensa. He also put forth a strenuous effort to become the political and ecclesiastical head of Rome, but in this he was doomed to disappointment. He interfered in the affairs of Denmark with the hope of bringing that kingdom to his support. He surely realized something of the task he had set himself and did not expect to win the battle for the church without a prolonged struggle. Meantime Henry was by no means idle. He had youth and energy on his side and suddenly discovered a vigor of action that surprised his most intimate friends. After the defeat which he suffered at the hands of the Saxons he threw himself with great energy into the movement of the German cities against the pretensions of the higher nobility and displayed great skill in binding them to his cause. The archbishop of Mainz and the dukes of Lorraine, Bohemia, and Bavaria, together with Rudolph of Suabia, joined them. In this way he for the first time had a powerful army at his back. He now proceeded to take vengeance on the Saxons for the defeat he had suffered at their hands. Without consulting the pope he attacked the Saxon army which, 60,000 strong, lay at Langensaltze, near Homburg, and completely overthrew them. Scarcely a man escaped. This made Henry the complete master of Germany and braced his courage for the conflict with the pope which he now saw was inevitable, as he believed the Lateran decree to be aimed at himself. All the emperors of his line had invested the clergy as well as the lay nobles of the empire. Henry II and Henry III, although they were reformers and thoroughly friendly to the church, had used the power of investiture to the fullest extent. It was scarcely to be supposed that, at a moment of victory, Henry would submit to having this power taken from him. The opportunity quickly presented itself of showing his hand. He was called upon to nominate a bishop to the see of Milan made vacant by the death of Erlambaldo. He immediately acquiesced by nominating Tedaldo, one of the most promi-

ment of the disaffected bishops, who had been excommunicated by Gregory and had never been reinstated. This thoroughly aroused the pope who sent a threatening letter to Henry commanding him to confess to a bishop and submit to a penance for having held intercourse with a person who was excommunicated. Henry did not propose to be dictated to and received the pope's legate in such an ungracious manner that he was summoned to appear before the next synod at Rome and answer for his contumacious conduct.

In the meantime trouble arose for the pope in another direction. Cencius, a leader of the malcontents in the city of Rome, and master of St. Angelo, made an attack upon Gregory on Christmas Eve, 1075, while he was celebrating midnight mass at the altar of the manger in Santa Maria Maggiore, with a small company of priests. This celebrated church was situated in a quarter of the city which had a very bad reputation. Cencius, with a band of followers, burst in upon the pope, seized him by the hair, dragged him from the building, and, placing him upon a horse behind a soldier, carried him off to one of his castles in the region of the Parione. This barbarous act roused the whole city to undertake his rescue. He was freed the next day and carried back to Santa Maria where he took up the interrupted mass where he left off and finished the service.

He now decided to take up the controversy with Henry and carry it to a successful issue. He demanded that the king restore the imprisoned Saxon bishops, and call a council at which the pope would appear to judge the accused bishops canonically, and the excommunicated be dismissed from office. He told the king in haughty terms that if he refused to do this he would cut him off like a rotten branch. The answer that Henry returned to this insolent demand was a national synod which met at Worms on January 25th, 1076. Here the national enthusiasm of the Germans displayed itself as never before in these controversies. Hugo Candidus, the cardinal who had extolled the virtues of Hildebrand at the time of his election, now came before Henry with a biography of the pope in which that august personage was arraigned as the very worst of men. He charged

him with having obtained his office by bribery and violence, and as being a man of licentiousness and cruelty. Hugo also forged a letter from the Roman senate, clergy and people commanding that he be removed from office. No one really believed the charges brought against Gregory. Two only, of all the clergy present, had the courage to declare that the condemnation of the pope was uncanonical. To them was presented the alternative of affixing their signatures to the charges or renouncing their allegiance to the king. As this latter choice meant execution for treason they deemed it best to make the decision unanimous. A decree was immediately drawn up embracing the main features of the charges against Gregory, and especially setting forth his alleged intimate relations with Beatrix, and stating that it "is common report that papal decisions and decrees are framed by certain women, and that the church is governed by a 'female saint.'" On these grounds the council renounced their allegiance to Gregory and refused longer to recognize him as pope. A letter in the name of the king repeated all the charges which had been made before the council, but couched in the most insulting language. "Henry, king, not by usurpation, but by God's holy ordinance, to Hildebrand, not pope, but false monk, how darest thou, who hast won thy power through craft, flattery, bribery, and force, stretch forth thy hand against the Lord's anointed, despising the precept of the true pope, St. Peter: 'Fear God, honor thy King'? Condemned by the voice of all bishops, quit the apostolic chair, and let another take it, who will preach the sound doctrine of St. Peter, and not do violence under the cloak of religion. I, Henry, by the grace of God King, with all my bishops, say unto thee, 'Step down! thou eternally damned!'" The action of this council must needs immediately be made known to the pope. Who would be courageous enough to deliver it? Roland, a priest of Parma, was finally induced to undertake the task.

The Latin synod to which the pope had summoned Henry to give an account of himself met on February 21st in the Lateran. Agnes, the mother of Henry, was present. There were also one hundred and ten bishops from Italy and Gaul,

together with a large number of abbots and monks, and a promiscuous throng of Roman clergy and laity. Germany was not represented. A hymn had been sung and the leading churchmen were engaged in the study of a strange portent. This was an egg on which was visible the form of a black snake squirming beneath a shield which was being pressed down upon its head. Roland now suddenly appeared, dusty from his long journey, and, addressing himself to Gregory, shouted in a loud voice: "The king and our bishops bid thee come down from the chair of St. Peter which thou hast gained by robbery." He then turned to the assembled cardinals and bishops and said: "Ye are bidden to receive another pope from the king who will come here at Pentecost; for this man is no longer pope but a ravening wolf."

The vast assembly was convulsed with rage and the prefect started toward him with drawn sword. Roland courageously stood his ground but would most certainly have been slain, had not Gregory intervened in his behalf and shielded him. He took the document from Roland's hand and then proceeded with the business in hand as if no interruption had taken place. Upon the following day Gregory read the resolution of the council at Worms and also the letter from Henry to the synod which was still smarting under the insulting words of Roland. They immediately passed a decree of excommunication against Siegfried of Mainz and all who had signed the acts of the council. The bishops of Lombardy were also excommunicated. But it was, of course, at Henry that the heaviest of all punishments was aimed. First a long solemn prayer was offered up to St. Peter as the representative of whom the pope claimed the power of binding and loosing in heaven and earth. Gregory then pronounced his sentence of deposition and excommunication upon the king as follows: "For the honor and security of the church, in the name of the Almighty and Triune God, I do prohibit Henry, king, son of Henry, the emperor, from ruling the kingdom of the Teutons and of Italy, and I release all Christians from the oath of allegiance to him which they have taken or shall take. And

inasmuch as he has despised obedience by associating with the excommunicate, by many deeds of iniquity, and by spurning the warnings which I have given him for his good, I bind him in the bands of anathema; that all the nations of the earth may know that thou art Peter, and that upon thy rock the Son of the living God hath built his church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Such a sentence as this had never been announced before by any pope. The nation was convulsed with dread over the outcome as it now saw clearly for the first time that the two great powers that had been for so long a time sparring for position, like two gladiators, were now joined in a deadly conflict. If the act of the pope in thus deposing and excommunicating an emperor was an unheard of thing, the act of the emperor in deposing a pope was even more astounding. It was interpreted as meaning nothing less than the absolute subjection of the ecclesiastical to the secular power, and the emperor could set up and pull down popes at his pleasure.

Gregory never entertained a doubt of the ultimate success of his plan. He called for the prayers of the faithful to the frustration of the plans of his enemies, but he did not stop with prayers. He strove with all his energy to strengthen the military forces of Rome, and entered into negotiations with Robert Guiscard and Roger, whom he had excommunicated for their rebellious conduct in the south. Beatrix and the husband of Mathilde both died while the pope was carrying on his negotiations, leaving their possessions which amounted to more than three-fifths of all Italy to Mathilde who, from her earliest recollection, had been taught to look upon the papacy as established by God, and to esteem Hildebrand as a close personal friend and to revere him as the wisest of all spiritual guides. It was certain that Gregory could rely upon the forces from her vast domains as if they were his own. This gave him troops sufficient to withstand any invasions from beyond the Alps. He now waited to hear what effect his decree had produced in Germany. The decree promulgated by the pope reached Germany in the form of an encyclical addressed "to all who desire to belong to the sheep of St. Peter." It produced con-

sternation everywhere and the king immediately felt the effects of it. The German nobility were a turbulent and independent body and at best gave but a half-hearted support to the king. They now took advantage of the freedom from their oaths given by Gregory to stand aloof and refuse to furnish the aid to the king which their feudal oath required of them. Henry summoned a great national council at Worms on May 15th, but nothing came of it. Other efforts to obtain national action came to nothing. Henry's cause was lost.

The nobles and prelates of Germany and Italy finally decided that they must do something. They called a general council at Tibur on the 16th of October and notified the pope of their action. He approved of this and appointed Altman, bishop of Passau, and Sieghard, patriarch of Aquileia, to attend as his legates. Here at the appointed time gathered a great concourse of nobility and all seemed to have forgotten their natural allegiance to the king and made haste to get over on the side of the pope. They immediately passed a vote sanctioning the action of the pope in excommunicating Henry. They then took up the question of deposing the king and debated that for a week. Meantime Henry with a few friends tarried at Oppenheim, a small village on the opposite side of the Rhine. He felt thoroughly alarmed and discouraged over the outlook and sent word to the council that he was willing not only to amend his conduct but to surrender the government to the whole body of nobles providing they left him the title and insignia of king. They finally decided to make a treaty. Henry was to make an absolute submission to the pope, making the condition that he was to obtain release from excommunication within twelve months from February 22nd, on pain of irrevocable forfeiture of the throne. It was announced that a diet would be held at Augsburg on February 2nd, 1077, the pope presiding, to determine the fate of the king and settle the affairs of the church and kingdom. Henry was to abide at Spier, deprived of all kingly authority and state and bereft of all companions but his wife, Dietrich, the bishop of Verdun, and a small staff of servants. In case

Henry agreed to these conditions and kept them, the nobles on their part promised to conduct him to Rome for his coronation, and to aid him in driving out the Normans from Italy; but if he broke one of them, they declared that they would renounce all allegiance and proceed immediately to the election of a new king. To all this Henry agreed. He immediately went to Spier and took up his residence in accordance with the terms of the treaty. He remained here for two months during which time he never set foot in a church and gave attention only to necessary political business. A few days before Christmas, Henry, accompanied by his wife and infant son, Conrad, secretly quitted Spier and proceeded to Besançon in upper Burgundy, where his mother's uncle, Count William, received them kindly and entertained them Christmas Day, after which the little party proceeded to the foot of Mount Cenis. Having finally obtained a safe conduct to pass through her territories from his mother-in-law, the Marchioness of Susa, Henry undertook the passage of the Alps. But the winter was unusually severe and the passes were choked with snow while the summits were coated with ice. Horses could not keep their feet and the queen, with her young son, was placed in a drag of skins and in this way drawn by means of guides.

Gregory had, in the meantime, announced his intention of attending the diet of Augsburg in person and settling the matter of succession to the German crown. He started on his journey, crossed the Apennines and was on his way to Mantua when messengers met him and announced that Henry had already crossed the Alps and was journeying to meet him. This was unwelcome news to the pope as he wished no reconciliation with the king and did not know but what he was accompanied by a large army. He therefore turned aside and journeyed to Canossa, a strong fortress belonging to Mathilde on the right bank of the Otranto, some twelve miles south and west of the village of Reggio. A marvellous view of the Apennines and of the Lombard plain as far as the city of Modina was commanded from this castle. It was surrounded by three walls and was considered impregnable to any assault from without. Gregory could not have

chosen a more secure asylum than this as it was well provisioned and strongly garrisoned, and was graced by the presence of Mathilde herself who was the lifelong friend of the pope. Here he waited the arrival of the enemy, if not with pleasure, yet with confidence. After completing the toilsome journey across the Alps, Henry with his wife and small retinue of servants proceeded to Turin where he was met by the excommunicated bishops who were greatly distressed by Henry's decision to submit to the pope, but being convinced that they could not change his purpose, they presented themselves in the garb of penitents and asked to be forgiven and reinstated. The pope admitted them to his presence and locked them in separate cells, placing them upon a diet of bread and water. He finally impressed upon these prelates rigorous penance, after which he released them from excommunication and sent them back to their offices with the charge to render no further homage or aid to Henry. Gregory at first refused to see Henry, but the latter succeeded in obtaining an interview with Countess Mathilde and sent through her a request to the pope to be released from the ban. Gregory refused this and demanded that the king should acknowledge himself deposed and declare himself unworthy to reign. Perceiving that nothing could be gained by negotiation, Henry suddenly presented himself in the garb of a penitent before the castle gate. He was only admitted as far as the second wall where "he was compelled to remain bare-footed in the snow and clothed in the penitential garb, shivering and hungry in the icy wind" (record). Even now the pope was unwilling to forgive him as he doubtless saw his own plans forestalled by this act. Mathilde had been nurtured in hatred for Henry as the enemy of her mother, but even she was moved to pity and besought the pope in vain to forgive him. Finally after three days of penitential humility and suffering, the king retired to the chapel of St. Nicholas where he besought Hugo, the abbot of Cluny, to intercede in his behalf. At last the haughty spirit of Gregory was moved and he reluctantly gave his consent for the admission of Henry to his presence. The king knelt at the feet of the pope and in

tears implored forgiveness. At last the pope raised him from the ground and gave him his blessing. He was afterwards conducted to a chapel where a mass was celebrated in commemoration of the event. And so ended in this manner one of the most remarkable scenes in the whole history of the world.

Prior to the admission of Henry to his presence, Gregory had insisted upon the terms of reconciliation being drawn up and signed by the representatives of the king. In this document the pope was represented by seven persons: two cardinal bishops, two cardinal priests, two cardinal deacons and one sub-deacon. The king was represented by the archbishop of Bremen, the bishops of Osnabruck and Vercelli, the abbot of Cluny, and several laymen. These persons drew up a contract which the king signed. In this he promised, "that he would attend a meeting of the German nobles whenever it should be called by the pope and be prepared to retain or forfeit his crown according as the pope, who would preside as arbiter, should pronounce him innocent or guilty of the crimes charged against him. Meanwhile he was to lay aside all insignia of royalty, and abstain from all royal functions, and his subjects were absolved from their oath of fealty; he was to provide a safe conduct for Gregory or his legate across the Alps and if he proved his innocence he was henceforth to obey the pope in everything which concerned the church."

If the penance of Henry was what it actually appears on the surface and not merely, as some say, an appearance only, with three pairs of hose on his "bare feet," and warm and plentiful clothing beneath the penitential robe, and the "three days" of waiting shortened to an hour each day with plenty to eat in the meantime, then the stubbornness of the pope and the severity of his demands are hard to account for and difficult to believe. If Gregory believed that the humbling of Henry was equivalent to that of the whole of Christendom, then we may find some justification for his severity. But there was grave danger in the imperial recognition of the supreme papal supremacy. Evidently in the eyes of Gregory this step was a necessity. But it is, never-

theless, quite certain that his harshness in a measure defeated his aims. The friends of the emperor were shocked and angered at the treatment he had received and were moved to pity, while the partisans of Gregory thought that he had pushed his advantage too far.

In summary we may say that the victory of the papacy was ineffaceable; the victory of Pope Gregory was soon turned to defeat, and he finally died far from home and friends with the bitter words upon his lips: "I have loved righteousness and hated iniquity, therefore I die in exile." All his grand schemes seemed to have fallen in ruin about him. After Canossa the conflict continued for more than forty years. Henry IV redeemed himself from the charge of being weak and wicked and changeable. Trial hardened him and brought out his really fine qualities, and proved him very much of a man. But he too died almost alone and his body was refused burial in consecrated ground. He lived, like Henry II of England, to see his sons go over to his enemies and lift their hands in rebellion against him. Broken-hearted, he too passed to the grave thinking that all he had contended for throughout his life was lost. Henry V, who betrayed his father and went over to the enemy, finally violated the pledges he had given to the pope and took up the cause in which his father had spent his life. After war had done its grievous work and laid waste the fertile fields of Germany and Italy, the strongholds of the contending parties, in turn taken and pillaged, the churches burned, and ruin and poverty spread throughout the land, both parties grew tired of the conflict and a diet was summoned at Wurtzburg, in 1121, to arrange terms for peace. After a session of eight days, the emperor and the diet accepted the principal basis of a settlement which had been proposed by a committee chosen at Mainz. This arrangement was reported to the pope by envoys and was approved by him. He stated in a letter to the emperor that "the church had no desire to diminish the imperial rights, but only to retain her own. She was not covetous of royal or imperial splendor; let the church enjoy what belonged to Christ, and the emperor what belonged to himself." As a

result of this amicable statement on the part of the pope, a council was summoned to meet at Worms on September 8th, 1122. To this council the entire clergy of the empire was summoned together with "dukes, counts, and all the faithful laity." The assembly which gathered in response to this call was a very large one and their deliberations lasted over a period of eight days. At the close of the debate which took place between the representatives of the emperor and the pope, a compromise was finally agreed upon. The declaration which received the signature of the emperor was as follows: "I, Henry, by the grace of God Roman emperor, out of love of God, the Holy Roman Church, and the Lord Pope Calixtus, do surrender to the holy apostles, Peter and Paul, and the holy Catholic Church, all investiture by ring and staff; and I ordain that in all churches of my realm canonical elections and free consecrations shall take place. The possessions and royal rights of St. Peter, whereof he had been deprived from the beginning of this strife to the present day, either in my father's time or in my own reign, I restore to the Holy Roman Church, so far as they are in my power; where they are not, I will honestly help to procure their restoration." The original declaration of Pope Calixtus has been strangely lost, but it was about as follows: "that the pope conceded to his beloved son, Henry, by the grace of God Roman emperor, that in the German Kingdom the election of bishops and abbots holding of the empire should be made in the presence of the emperor or his commissioner, free from force or bribery, with an appeal in disputed cases to the metropolitan and bishops of the province. The elected prelate was then to receive all temporalities, save those held directly of the Roman See, by the touch of the scepter and was faithfully to discharge all duties thereto belonging." After these declarations had been signed and read in the council, the bishop of Ostia celebrated mass, administered the elements to the emperor, and gave him the kiss of peace. In this manner, Henry was restored to the church without any formal action on his part, and the breach between the pope and the emperor was finally healed. The papacy was finally emanci-

pated from control by the emperor in purely ecclesiastical functions. *Thus a part of that for which Gregory fought was solemnly ratified as the Law of Christendom.*

The concordat of Worms must be recognized as a great advance in political righteousness despite its many shortcomings and fallacies. States in the modern sense had not yet been formed, and the institution through which society might form a provisional order must be recognized as a good and legitimate institution. This was what Gregory VII organized and what the people of Europe made legitimate by their consent. It is the church historian Coleridge who says: "During the Middle Ages, the papacy was another name for a confederation of learned men in the west of Europe against the barbarism and ignorance of the times." The papacy derived its right to rule Europe from the acquiescence of Europe.

In summary, the Concordat of Worms shows that a dual government was attempting to rule the Christian world. The dream of universal dominion over the secular interests of men was, in the eleventh century, embodied in the person of German princes elevated to the imperial dignity by the consent of the other great lords of that portion of Europe. The Almighty was represented on earth by another potentate who, in the theory of the church, held unlimited sway over the souls of men. This was an unequal partnership, and such distribution of sovereignty was practically impossible. The first round in the struggle of elimination culminated in compromise, the Concordat of Worms.

## CHAPTER XXXIV

### THE REVOLT OF THE ITALIAN STATES

THE mediaeval drama which was staged by Gregory VII has reached the end of the first act. The second act is in the nature of an interlude which serves to hasten the development of the plot and to bring about the culmination of the play. The struggles of the Italian states for their liberties indirectly forced the decision of the contest between the papacy and the empire, and resulted in the assertion of political principles which, especially in England, were made the foundation of modern liberty. The cities which took part in this momentous struggle now beginning were for the most part located in Lombardy, but those of Piedmont, Venice, Liguria, Tuscany, the States of the Church, Naples, and Sicily were also involved.

The distinctive characteristics of the municipal towns, during the Roman régime, did not rest upon the basis of origin or geographical position, but upon the peculiar constitution of the city to which the term was applied. Municipal rights were at first granted by Rome to certain cities in Latium and Italy. As her conquests increased, these *municipia* were extended beyond Italy and may be found in the far East, in Egypt, Macedonia, Greece, Africa, Spain, and Gaul. The word *municipium* has not at all times been identical in its meaning. The dominant idea of a municipal town, however, is a town to which liberty of legislation and freedom of internal administration has been accorded. The greater number of *municipia*, although they enjoyed the free exercise of their own institutions, had, like the colonies, a political system something analogous to that of Rome herself. The assembly of the citizens of each municipality had and exercised whatever sovereign rights had been bestowed by Rome, and elected the chief magistrates. These were

usually two in number and were called *duumviri*. They roughly corresponded to the Roman consuls and had similar duties, only on a smaller and wholly local scale. Besides, each municipality had a number of subordinate officers, aediles, censors, and quaestors, for their police and local finance. These were designated to maintain the balance of power in the municipality just as they did in Rome. The legal system of each was a close copy of the mother city. After Tiberius had taken away from the citizens of Rome the right of electing the officers and carrying on, through their *comitia*, the civil government, and vested these powers in the senate, the municipalities throughout the empire followed suit. Each seems to have created a class called "*curiales*" or "*decuriones*" (a sort of senate) in whom was vested all powers which were previously placed in the whole body of citizens. This aristocratic class now chose all the officers and carried on all the government not reserved to the pro-consul or other Roman magistrates. They formed a local aristocracy of wealth requiring for membership some four thousand dollars' worth of property. But every son of a *decurion* was by reason of his birth a member of this class, so that it was recruited in the manner of a close corporation. It was summoned on the Kalends of March for the purpose of choosing municipal officers. The *duumviri* or consuls were here chosen to hold office for one year. Besides the municipal officers chosen by the *decuriones*, there was another very important magistrate chosen by the citizens at large for a term of five years. This was the *Defensor Civitatis (Urbis)*. He acted as a standing advocate for the city against the oppression of the provincial government. He had to be a well known and highly respected man. He stood to the inhabitants of the municipality in somewhat the same relation that the ancient tribune of the people did to the early Roman states.

It may be reasonably doubted whether the principles of freedom and justice which led to the establishment of these municipal institutions were fully carried out in effect. They had, however, a short golden age. While the emperor was gradually monopolizing the authority that belonged to the

ancient *comitia*, the leading citizens of the municipalities throughout Rome discovered that they were powerless in national politics, and transferred their attention to local administration. These municipalities, unmolested by central government, flourished. Membership of the *decuriones* or governing body was eagerly sought after and held as a high honor. This was especially true from the time of Augustus to Constantine. But from the latter's administration until the fall of the Western Empire, the resources of the central power had diminished, while its wants steadily increased. To raise the necessary revenue, the emperor began to inflict very heavy taxes upon the municipalities and the *decuriones* were held responsible for the collection of the same and their private estates confiscated to make up any deficit which took place. "The position of the governing class thus became unbearable, but was nevertheless incumbent on all citizens holding not less than twenty-five acres of land. The honor of office became no sufficient compensation for the burden of taxation and the responsibility of its collection, and the *decuriones* endeavored in every way to evade this law. Laws were made compelling them to remain at home and undergo their onerous duties. Under this the curial class steadily decreased in numbers and wealth, but there was still in existence, at the beginning of the fifth century, especially in Gaul and throughout the valley of the Po, a considerable class of good family and fair fortunes, dwelling for the most part in cities or country homes in the near neighborhood of cities. These replenished the church and kept up the politeness and luxury of the empire." They formed the nobility of the senatorial rank still to be found at the time of the invasions.

When the Germans overflowed the long established boundaries of the empire and took possession of the land, they found the municipalities or cities scattered everywhere. Some of them were utterly destroyed during the process of conquest. Most of them lived on in a shrunken sort of existence. The Germans knew nothing of cities or city life. They settled down in the country leaving the cities pretty much to themselves. At the time of Charles the Great by

far the larger number of the Germans were still living on the soil continuing their old-time method of life. The noble was in the castle which crowned some neighboring height. The body of his free followers were clustered at the foot of the hill in a rude sort of a village or settlement. The violence of the times compelled them to enclose these settlements with walls, but at first they were entirely exposed to the inroads of wandering enemies. The old municipalities closed up the breaches in their walls made by the barbarians and continued for a time the life which had been thus rudely interrupted. But the insecurity of the roads destroyed commerce and hindered travel, so that the municipalities which depended upon these sources of wealth for subsistence gradually decayed and perished. But the knowledge of this form of government was never lost. The *Defensor Urbis* and the lower municipal magistrates lived on throughout the early Frankish rule. They did not retain all their powers, it is true, but they served as a pattern for later-day communal governments. The functions of the *Defensor Urbis* were frequently exercised by the bishop. Indeed, it quite frequently happened that the bishop was elected to this office and performed its duties in addition to those of his own. The bishop came, in this way, to be as much the civil governor of his city as the count was in the rural district. Under the administration of Charles the Great and his successors, the city in Italy became the natural unit of administration. Country districts were under the control of a count whose administration very generally extended over the neighboring city which was considered as located within his jurisdiction. In case it was not, then it usually belonged to a bishop. Whether bishop or count, the populace had nothing to do with the government. The count or bishop collected the taxes, appointed the officials, kept order and punished offenders. Perhaps a few of the minor offices were still in the gift of the people and this served to keep alive the old-time right of election. "This was a great revolution in the internal history of cities," says Hallam, "and one which generally led to the discontinuance of this popular institution; so that after the reign of Charlemagne,

if not earlier, we may perhaps consider a municipality choosing its own officers as an exception, though not a very infrequent one, to the general usage."

During the time of the old Roman Empire, Italy was pre-eminently the country of cities. Milan, Boulogne, Capua, rivaled the splendors of Rome, while others of importance were scattered over the entire peninsula. While the Ostrogoths were in possession these cities were rebuilt and others added to their number. Then came the decay of the empire and the conquest of Italy by the Lombards. It has long been a question as to what extent these invaders destroyed the cities, but it seems certain that something of their old character and importance remained. Feudalism never obtained a firm hold upon Italy and it was cast off by that country with comparative ease long before the other nations of Europe succeeded in freeing themselves. This was doubtless due to the influence of the cities. Throughout Lombard and French rule, every city in Italy together with its adjacent district was subject to the government of a count who was himself subordinate to the duke or marquis of the province. The early German emperors followed the custom of cutting away country districts from the towns and bestowing them by a feudal tenure upon rural lords to whom they gave the title of counts. In this way the authority of the original officers was curtailed and confined almost to the walls of their own cities. In many cases the bishops obtained a grant of the temporal power, and exercised the functions which had previously belonged to the counts. By the middle of the ninth century nearly every city in Italy had surrounded itself with a wall and assumed the right of self-defense. They were successful in beating off the incursions of the Magyars and on account of this began to assume the airs of independence. Their bishops levied taxes, dispensed justice, and commanded the military without consulting the old-time count. The cities thus became independent of all save the authority of the emperor. Meantime a lively commerce sprang up and industries grew apace. The inhabitants began to group themselves by their occupation into arts or guilds in order that they might be the bet-

ter protected from the grasping hand of the feudal lord. As yet they had no political power save a nominal share in the choice of the bishops and, possibly, the election of the minor officers of the city. But it was already easy to see what would be the outcome of this popular awakening. As soon as the people became conscious of their power it would take a greater authority than that of a peace-loving bishop to keep them from asserting it. Take, for instance, Milan, the largest and most prosperous of all the Italian cities, with her 300,000 inhabitants and numerous guilds of artisans. Her bishop had become practically absolute, but what would he do in case these people should act politically as they had already acted industrially?

Out of the confusion which accompanied the conflict in the authority between the count, the bishop, and the duke, not unmixed with the popular claim to control through the old *Defensor Urbis*, there grew up another power, first tentatively here and there, then triumphantly everywhere, in Lombardy. This was the commune, an organized popular movement which had its origin in the various guilds of artisans. These guilds consisted of all those who within certain limits exercised the trades common to the time. The members of a guild fell into sharply defined grades: (1) The apprentice, bound by contract to a master, for a definite term of years, during which time he received his living and his instruction and paid such work as he could do together with money fee; (2) the journeyman or skilled laborer working for wage; (3) the master, who had given sufficient and formal evidence of his capacity as a workman and his credit as a man. These guilds chose their own officers and made their own laws. They kept themselves in harmony with the feudal lords or bishop of the city through their seigniorial official or prevot. When these several guilds made common cause, then the artisan class came forward into positive political action. They embraced within their numbers the vast body of the lower order of citizens. Above them was the class of merchants, wholesale dealers, and money lenders, who formed the dominant aristocracy of the city. These new artisan groups, united for mutual benefit, formed the

*communes.* These were permeated with a democratic spirit and pushed to active endeavor by industrial and commercial interests. They became the forerunners of the modern society and state.

The internal history of the Italian cities during the tenth and eleventh centuries consists in a large degree in the efforts of the great laboring democracy to work its way up to political equality with the controlling aristocratic element. At the close of the period this movement was generally successful and democracy forced its way to recognition. The struggle was very largely one between city and country. The old feudal state, which took the place of the Roman, was built upon agricultural interests and an aristocratic spirit, while the city life was from the first popular and industrial. A conflict was sure to come. The city was being continually reinforced by every new industry and every intellectual acquisition, while the country was continually weakened by the desertion of their rural population to the more magnetic centers of the new life. The country was conservative.

The conflict between the people and their rulers began at Cremona in 1003, when the bishop, Landulf, was driven out of the city and his castle destroyed. This movement spread, until by the end of the eleventh century a municipal government of the new pattern is to be found in every Lombard city. The conflict between the popes and the emperors over investitures aided in this development. Both popes and emperors were looking for allies and were willing to pay for them by grants of privileges. The cities were not slow to take advantage of this. It is worthy of note that the aristocracy and nobility of the city, after a short conflict, threw in their lot with the workmen and made common cause against the rulers. This greatly strengthened the commons, as it brought both wealth and political experience to their side. It was also the part of wisdom for the upper classes thus to act, as it gave them a share in the management of the new movement which they were powerless to check. When the consuls emerged for the first time from the political chaos at Milan, early in the twelfth century, and appear in

the public documents as the administrative magistrates of the city, they are plainly distinguished as members of the three orders, the upper nobility, the lesser nobility, and the merchant guilds.

The consular constitution presents a great variety of forms in the different cities, but there were three essential elements, consuls, a council, and a parliament. The consuls varied in number. There were twelve in Milan, six at Pisa and Genoa, and four at Florence. They were invested with executive and judiciary powers, the functions of which they usually divided among themselves, so that some led the army, while others presided over the courts; others still performed administrative duties. Next to the consuls was a senate made up of persons elected from the whole body of citizens. They formed an advisory body and had to be consulted in all important business. At the base of this constitution was the general assembly of free citizens or parliament gathering by wards at the sound of the bell from the belfry on the public square. This was the real sovereign power and judge in the last resort. It was irregularly called and was an unwieldy body at best, controlled, like a mob, by factions. Sometimes it did good; more often evil. But it evidenced the principle of popular government and trained the great body of citizens in political methods.

This consular constitution looks singularly well on paper; it leaves almost nothing to be wished for, but if we examine more closely we will discover that this new organization was weakened by class distinction and the local feuds that were bred thereby. There was no town so small that it did not have its noble class, its bourgeois proprietor class, and its industrial class or parliament. Even the nobility was not united, but split into the upper and lower nobility. All this was natural enough. Prejudices, castes, families, and guilds segregated the society of the Middle Ages and these could not be overcome in a day. The new constitution did not extend the privileges of citizenship to all classes. The franchise was not made universal. The lower guilds and the plebs were not given a share in the government. The big bell did not ring for them to assemble. This change of so-

society within the city and the withholding of citizenship from a large number meant stormy weather ahead. Democracy brought not peace but a sword.

Throughout the eleventh century the cities were in continual conflict with each other. This was to be expected, as it was in accordance with the manners of the age. But even here we discover the traces of the change which has taken place. The annals speak not of leaders, of dukes, or of counts and their doings, but rather of the transactions of the people. It is the people of Pisa that gain a victory over the people of Lucca in 1002. The people of Pisa and Genoa conquer the people of Sardinia in 1006. The citizens of Pavia and Milan engage in war in 1051. They raised armies, made alliances, hired foreign troops, and in every way acted as independent states. During the eighty years which followed the coronation of Otto I (962), twelve German invasions of Italy were made to enforce imperial claims and compel the obedience of the Italian cities. These generally came to nothing. Italian lords paid tribute to the emperors, as to their suzerains, but were otherwise free. The cities were wont even to refuse this tribute. The war between emperors and popes increased this independence. The citizens of towns lost all national feeling and confined themselves wholly to the narrow circles of local activity. They engaged in struggles with the rural counts and reduced them to a state of subjection. They overthrew the smaller towns in their neighborhood that had imitated themselves in establishing municipalities. These they added to their own territory. By the end of the twelfth century the Marquis of Montferrat was the only nobleman who had not submitted to some city. The rural nobility have been compelled to reside within some city and to give their strength to the direction of municipal affairs. Within the strong walls and deep trenches and in the midst of their well-peopled streets the industrious townsmen dwelt secure from the license of armed pillagers and the oppression of feudal lords. These artisans assumed the right of bearing arms in the defense of their city, although they were looked upon with contempt by the military land-holders of the country. The citizens

were divided into companies in accordance with their crafts, each company having a tribune or standard-bearer about whom they rallied in the market-place in case an enemy threatened. While these cities were thus growing rapidly and flourishing in their new-found freedom, their restlessness and ambition did not confine themselves within their own city walls and to their legitimate advancement. They reached out and tyrannized over their weaker neighbors, snatching their liberties from them instead of extending them with their own. The same narrow and fatal policy which had wrecked the liberty of the freedom-loving cities of ancient Greece now took possession of Milan. She conducted herself in such an overbearing manner toward her weaker neighbors that they formed a combination against her and overthrew her.

During all this time the sovereignty of the empire had dragged on a wasted and shrunken existence, but was in theory always acknowledged. The name of the emperor appeared in the public acts of each of the Italian cities and also graced their coins. Whenever an emperor made a journey into Italy the courts of the several cities where he visited adjourned and all officers held themselves subject to his command. The customary supplies, under the name of *fodrum regale*, were furnished in abundance. A castle for the emperor's residence was furnished by the wily citizens *outside the fortifications* where the noise of the city streets would not disturb his slumbers. Here their royal visitor had to be content to stay. Such was the condition of Italy when Frederic Barbarossa, the nephew of the emperor Conrad, the first of the great family of the Hohenstaufens, assumed the throne of Germany. He was a man of commanding ability and tried valor. But his temper was severe and arbitrary in the extreme, which fact made him a rather difficult man to please. Absolutely honest and trustworthy, he claimed never to have violated an oath, broken a promise, or forgiven an enemy. He was undoubtedly the greatest man who appeared on the mediaeval stage, the very embodiment of mediaeval imperialism. He proclaimed the loftiest notions of his supremacy over all other authorities: that his power was directly from God and in no way from the pope.

To assert that his authority came to him in any way through the successor of St. Peter was, in the opinion of Frederic, both blasphemy and treason. His determination was to establish the empire on the same lines of authority and power as those of Charles the Great. In 1154, he descended into Italy to enforce his feudal claims.

The attempt of Barbarossa to enforce his feudal claims upon the cities of Italy brought about the Republican revolution. In this great movement there are two scenes of paramount importance: (1) the republicanism of Arnold of Brescia at war with both emperor and pope, and (2) the church lending its influence to the cities to undermine the power of the emperor.

(1) Arnold of Brescia was born of German parents in the Italian city of Brescia which is located some forty miles east of Milan. His parents were of the noble class and Arnold had the advantage of excellent training. When about nineteen years of age he went to Paris, being drawn to that greatest of mediaeval universities by the fame of the great schoolman and philosopher, Abelard, who now had the eyes of the learned world turned to him. His was undoubtedly the most brilliant mind of the mediaeval age. Before he had reached his twenty-fifth year he had overthrown the champions of the realistic school and established himself as a nominalistic philosopher at the University of Notre Dame. I here attempt no sketch of Abelard, but wish only to set forth his teaching for the light thrown upon the political life of the times. We have seen how "the third estate" had gradually developed throughout the cities of Italy till it threatened the very life of the empire. During all these years democracy had forged ahead in a dogged sort of way without being able to give any philosophic reason for its existence. Life had been hard and unpoetic for democracy, with no opportunity for learning and no leisure for philosophy. In the city the common people labored for a scant enough living at the tasks which were looked upon with contempt by nobles and rich burgers alike. In the country the great mass of the people were pressed down with their feet in the mud and their shoulders bent with the great weight of

the whole feudal society which they carried. The empire had a Dante to cast into literary form its God-given right to rule mankind. The papacy had produced a St. Augustine to formalize, and a Hildebrand to enforce its claim to rule not only the souls but the bodies of men. Meantime democracy, burdened as it was with the weight of both empire and papacy, struggled on up toward political recognition with no one to sing its praises or to voice its divine right "to a place in the sun." Then it was that Abelard appeared as the champion of the common man. He not only denied the claims of the realists, but utterly overthrew them. He ridiculed the imperial theory of government and showed the folly of any such claim in unanswerable argument. This pleased the church and the pope was ready to make a cardinal of him. Next he assailed the papal theory and with equal vehemence and clearness showed that there never was any universal church, but only individual churches made up of individual members. Therefore the popes had no such thing as universal power. The pope, now, instead of making of Abelard a cardinal, summoned him to trial as a heretic. But Abelard was a profound philosopher and a reasoner beyond compare. He placed all government with the people where it belonged and claimed that the only valid law, whether in church or state, was that made by the people as a whole, and that the emperor and the pope were nothing more than the servants of the people to be chosen and dismissed by them. Thus he furnished to democracy its philosophy, its God-ordained right to exist and govern itself. Yet Abelard was a theorist and idealist rather than a practical man of affairs. He never put forth an effort to see his philosophy put into practice, and when he was challenged by the church he recanted.

Arnold became an ardent disciple and friend of Abelard. He accepted with his whole heart and soul the views of his great teacher. In one respect he was superior to his master. His German blood gave to him a steadfastness and tenacity of purpose which his friend lacked. He reasoned that if the right to rule was vested in the people themselves, and not in either emperor or pope, then emperor and pope

were both usurpers and as such should be deposed and the people reinvested with their rights. With Arnold, to believe this, was to at once endeavor to put the principle in force. He returned to his native city where he was made provost of a foundation of Canons Regular. Here he very quickly became influential both in the spiritual and political life of the town. He had many of the characteristics of his brilliant teacher: a love of morality, a restless vanity and an acute and critical mind. He had a practical side that was not a characteristic of Abelard. He preached that "priests were to live on tithes and free offerings of the faithful; that bishops were to renounce their regalia and monks their lands, and the laity only should rule the state." The outcome of this would be to reduce the powerful Gregorian clergy to the primitive apostolic poverty, to confiscate their wealth, and to deprive them of all secular power. But this did not make him a champion of the imperial cause. He also aimed at the reform of the civil power. He vested the government in the laity and not in the emperor. His ideal was a great Christian republic governed by a popular assembly. He thus vested the right of governing, as I have previously said, in the people themselves and in neither pope nor emperor. This was a denial of both the great theories of government and as a result brought upon him the enmity of both pope and emperor. He found himself in the position of an ambitious boy who in a moment of exaltation kicked two strong men at one and the same time. Brescia, under his leadership, cast off the rule of Bishop Manfred and became a republic like the rest of the Italian cities. Pope Innocent II championed the cause of his deposed bishop and, at the Lateran council of 1139, had Arnold deprived of his benefices and banished from Italy. Arnold went first to join his old teacher at the council of Sens and afterwards followed him to Paris, where he taught in Abelard's school on Mont. St. Genevieve. But his doctrine of poverty did not please the clerks that gathered there and he was compelled to retire to Zurich where he remained for a short time. He is next found preaching throughout upper Subia under the protection of Cardinal Guido, an old friend of the Paris days. In

1145 Arnold returned to Rome with Guido and was reconciled to the church. He soon enters upon the greatest period of his life.

While revolution had changed the other Italian cities into republics, driving out the tyrannical bishops and counts, Rome, through the influence of her bishop, the sovereign pontiff, had been saved. Her turn now came. The old Roman spirit of opposition to the pope had been revived by the struggle carried on by Anacletus, and the people longed to accomplish for their city what had been done in Milan, Brescia, and other cities throughout Italy. They set up a "commune" in 1143 in opposition to Innocent II. A senate composed of fifty-six members was formed and the sacred letters S.P.Q.R. again appeared in the public documents, and the date was reckoned from the restoration of the sacred senate. Innocent II kept up the struggle with this republican power until his death, in 1143. His successor, Celestine II, did not live long enough to accomplish anything. He was utterly powerless in the hands of the commune, and died in March, 1144. He was succeeded by Lucius II who tried to suppress the commune by force, but was, instead, himself thrown down from the steps of the capitol while the revolution triumphed. Eugenius III was chosen to the vacancy made by the death of Lucius. He was a timid monk who enjoyed the friendship and patronage of St. Bernard. He almost immediately fled to France, leaving the government of Rome in the hands of the commune. Arnold of Brescia now abandoned his spiritual exercises and put himself at the head of the Roman revolution. His hope was to free Rome forever from priestly rule, and by his eloquence he won over the whole city to his side. Conrad was appealed to to concur and free the city from the alien rule of the popes and to establish himself in the ancient rights of Rome, but he was too busy with his crusades to pay any attention to the summons. Eugenius returned to Rome and accepted the new order of things himself, acting as spiritual guide only.

But Frederic Barbarossa was in no way disposed to give up his claim to Italy without a struggle. Filled with great schemes of restoring the dignity and power of the empire,

he crossed the Alps in 1154 and proceeded on his way to Rome. Italy everywhere received him with royal welcome but this was not sufficient for Frederic. He burned and razed the cities of Ancona and Fortune to the ground, because the one refused to submit to the Marquis of Montferrat and the other to break its alliance with Milan, which city was the head and front of the Lombard independence. The emperor might have seen from these examples of stubbornness what the task was which he had undertaken but he did not. At his first diet, held at Roncaglia near Piacenza, he received the homage of the barons and cities of Italy, although Milan held sullenly aloof. After he had given to the free cities a taste of his method he hastened on to Rome to keep the promise which he had made to Eugenius III three years before. This was to reduce the rebellious city in return for the promise of the imperial crown and papal support against his enemies. When he drew near Rome he found himself confronted by a new set of difficulties. Eugenius III died in 1153, in the very midst of revolution and turmoil. He was succeeded by the mild and gentle Anastasius IV who lived on in Rome letting the commune have its will. In 1154, after a pontificate of less than a year and a half, Anastasius died and an Englishman, Nicholas Breakspear by name, was raised to the vacant chair. He was a man of character and energy and prepared to take the highest views of papal right. He could have nothing but contempt for the assumption of power on the part of the commune. He immediately took measures to destroy this power and reestablish the authority of the pope, but the commune had held its own for ten years and was puffed up over its reestablishment of the ancient laws and liberties of Rome. Street riots followed any attempt on the part of the pope to assert his power. In one of these a cardinal was slain. As a last resort Adrian renewed with Frederic the Treaty of Constance which Eugenius made.

This was the situation which met Frederic when he arrived at Rome. The commune sent ambassadors to meet him and to make a beautiful speech in which they informed him of their revival of the ancient splendors of Rome and their determination to hand all this over to him on the condition

of receiving a round sum of money and the confirmation of their ancient privileges. Frederic treated their pretensions with scorn and informed them that he came as a sovereign to demand and not as a suppliant to receive favors. When Frederic had thus summarily disposed of the claims of the republic and dismissed the crestfallen ambassadors, he turned to the pope who was glad enough to make terms with him, and, although a momentary difficulty arose over the refusal of Frederic to hold Adrian's stirrup while the latter mounted, an amicable agreement was entered into by these rival dignitaries. Frederic received the imperial crown at St. Peter's and, in turn, overthrew the pope's enemies in a hotly contested battle about the bridge of the Tiber. Arnold of Brescia was captured by the emperor and handed over to the pope. He was later condemned for heresy, hanged and his body afterwards burned. He thus became "the first in the long series of martyrs to liberty whose blood stains the records of the triumphant church."

The combination which was for the time established between emperor and pope did not last very long. The pope was not able to maintain himself long in Rome when Frederic's army was withdrawn. The emperor was compelled to hasten back north by reason of pressing business, without having reduced Rome to obedience to the pope, nor chastising King William of Sicily for his pillaging expeditions. The pope saw that if he kept even a fragment of his power he must himself fight for it. Therefore he formed a league with the feudal barons of Apulia who were ready to revolt against a sovereign whose growing power they feared. He also negotiated with the Greek emperor, Manuel I, for the humbling of King William, promising to grant him in return for his help three Neapolitan seaports. The king of Sicily was alarmed at this coalition of powers against him and hastened to make terms with Adrian, becoming his vassal and receiving from him Apulia and Sicily as fiefs. Thus without any aid from Frederic the pope had turned the chief enemies of the Holy See into friends and allies. While Adrian had been thus strengthening his own hands, Frederic had not been idle. As soon as he had reached Germany he

began the work of unification and consolidation which he had left unfinished in order to go to Italy. He made terms with Henry of Austria by investing him with the new duchy of Austria which was made independent of Bavaria. Henry, the Lion, was by this plan weakened and the way was prepared for his entire subjugation, which took place in 1180. Northern and eastern Germany was now handed over to Albert the Bear and the two Harrys, while Frederic gave his attention to the southwest. He deprived Hermann, Count Palatine, of his territory for his attack on Mainz, and gave it to his half-brother, Conrad, thus forming, by the union of this territory with the previous holdings of Conrad, the new Palatinate with Heidelberg as its chief city. Frederic now married for his second wife Beatrice, the heiress of the count of Burgundy, thus strengthening his hold upon the Middle Kingdom, and materially extending his own domains.

After completing all these labors the emperor held a diet at Besançon, in 1157, which was widely attended. Here trouble showed itself between the pope and the emperor. Each claimed to be lord of the world, and neither could agree as to the limits of his power. The union, which had been brought about by the common danger threatening them from Arnold and the commune, was of a very brief duration. They soon fell back into their old-time positions of watchful hostility. Frederic was angered at the pope for his alliance with William and the agreement which he had made with the Roman commune. The pope feared the increasing power of the emperor and was anxious to strengthen his own hands. He further felt provoked because Frederic had imprisoned the Swedish archbishop of Lund, who was an old friend in the missionary days in the north. He sent Roland Bandinelli of Siena, cardinal of the Roman church, to the diet of Besançon to state his grievances to the emperor. The salutation of this dignitary of the church was misconstrued into an offense. He said: "The pope greets you as a father and the cardinals greet you as brothers." Frederic thought that the cardinals were setting up a new claim to rank equal to Caesar. A wrong use of the phrase *conferre beneficia*,

or rather a wrong translation of it, caused indignation to burst forth. It was thought that Adrian was claiming that Frederic held the empire as a fief from him. Frederic circulated a declaration of his rights throughout the empire which ran as follows: "The empire is held by us, through the election of the princes, from God alone, who gave the world to be ruled by two necessary swords, and taught through St. Peter that men should fear God and honor the king. Whosoever says that we receive the imperial crown from the lord Pope as a benefice goes against the Divine command and the teaching of Peter, and is guilty of falsehood." The outcome of this matter was that Adrian was forced to explain the use which he had made of the word "beneficium." He said that he had used it in its general sense of benefit, and not in its feudal sense of fief. This for a time bridged over the difficulty and outwardly pope and emperor remained at peace.

In the early summer of 1158 Frederic undertook an expedition into Italy at the head of a great army. He gave, as a reason for this movement, the arrogance of the Milanese who had "raised their heads against the Roman empire." The cities of Lombardy were at this time divided into two rival leagues which were bitterly opposed to one another. Brescia, Crema, Parma, Piacenza, and Modena formed a league with Milan at the head. Pavia headed the second confederacy which included Lodi, Como, and Cremona. The latter league sided with the emperor. After a fierce struggle, in which the forces of Milan were pretty much exhausted, that city submitted to the emperor the ratification of the appointment of their consuls. Frederic was much pleased over what he considered an easy victory. He summoned a second diet at Roncaglia which met from the 11th to the 25th of September. Here came the most famous of the doctors of the civil law from the celebrated school of Bologna. They did not hesitate to confirm the imperial power as against all the claims of the cities and of the pope. They invested the haughty Hohenstaufen with all the absolutism of Justinian. Their study of the Roman civil law had blinded them to all the facts of seven hundred years of his-

tory. "Lord of the world," they styled Frederic. "Whatever pleases the prince has the force of law, since the people have transferred to him all their own sovereignty and power." It was announced at this diet that the emperor had resolved to take back again all his royal rights which had for so long a time been held in abeyance. He was willing, however, to reinvest both lay and ecclesiastical lords as well as the towns with all the rights to which they had legal claim. A *podesta* was to be established as the supreme governor of each town. This representative of the emperor was usually a stranger who had no sympathy whatever with the town he ruled. He was generally hated as despot and intruder. As soon as the diet dissolved, Rainald of Dassel and Otto of Wittelsbach went to the various towns throughout Lombardy appointing *podestas*. This angered the cities beyond control. Milan was disgusted because the emperor violated the terms of her capitulation, and broke into open revolt, refusing to receive the *podesta* who had been assigned to her. Other cities joined in the revolt. Frederic massed his troops against Milan which held out for three years and was then forced by famine to open her gates. The emperor made a virtue of granting the Milanese their lives, but forbade them to dwell in the open village which remained after the walls and fortifications had been torn down. They were scattered among the neighboring cities and the relics of the three Magi of the East, which were a source of so much pride, were taken to Cologne and are still one of the chief glories of that city. By this terrible punishment meted out to Milan, it would seem that the independence of the Italian cities was forever lost and that Frederic was king as well as emperor.

The church was alarmed at the success of Frederic and Adrian IV set himself the task of forming a league against him and threatened him in every way possible. In 1159, the pope's plans were cut short by death and Cardinal Roland was elected in his stead, taking the title of Alexander III. The new pope continued the policy of Adrian and showed great vigor in raising up enemies against Frederic. He encouraged the Lombard cities to rise once more and unite for

their common defense. In 1164 Verona, Piacenza, Padua, and Treviso rose in revolt against their new *podestas* and formed a league for their own safety and preservation. The pope excommunicated Frederic and aided the cities in re-building Milan. The emperor again set out upon a journey to Italy, making his fourth trip across the Alps. He hastened directly to Rome, which city he captured after a long siege. But this delayed him so long that his army was exposed to the pestilence that visits that district every autumn. The flower of his army was cut off and he was compelled to recross the Alps without doing anything to punish the rebellious Lombard cities.

No sooner had the emperor reached Pavia on his return journey, and there halted to refresh his troops, than the Lombard League took its final shape. The organization was completed in 1168. Milan, which had again sprung into prominence, took the lead. This time there was no division. Adversity had taught its lesson of unity and all the Lombard cities, some with bad grace, united for the common safety. Only Pavia remained upon the side of the emperor and this because Frederic was present in person to repress any movement on her part. The members of this league pledged themselves to aid each other against all who would make war against them or would exact anything more from them than had been customary before the time of Frederic Barbarossa. When they drove out the *podestas*, they re-established the consuls of the republican régime. They now chose from among these a body of rectors for the management of federal affairs. They proceeded to take possession of all the passes of the Alps so that Frederic could get back home only by the roundabout way of Susa and Mont Cenis. Alexander III sent the league his blessing and this brought with it some solid advantages, as other cities now joined the confederation. In the spring of 1168 they founded the new city of Alessandria, named in honor of the pope, in a marshy district on the banks of the Tanaro. This they fortified in the strongest manner. This city grew so rapidly that within a year it had a population sufficient to furnish 15,000 fighting men. The establishment of Alessandria pushed the

power of the league westward and protected the highway which led from Milan to Genoa, and gave the league access to the sea. This movement cut off all communication between the emperor and the southern portion of his domain.

Six years went by without any attempt on the part of Frederic to overthrow this new enemy. He was kept busy north of the Alps. But in 1174 he made his fifth expedition into Italy determined to punish these rebellious cities. He had only a small army, a mere fragment of the host which he had previously led. He destroyed Susa and laid siege to Alessandria, which his adherents named in derision "Alessandria of Straw." But the straw city bravely held out till the army of the league came to its assistance. Here a truce was struck for a time and the armies did not engage in battle. This truce, however, did not last for long, as in 1176 the opposing forces met in the plain which stretches from the river Alona westward to the Ticino, about seventeen miles northwest of Milan, and hard by the little village of Legnano. Here the imperial army was disastrously defeated after a stubborn battle, and the emperor made his way on foot and in disguise to Pavia. Frederic was now compelled to give up the struggle. He consented to the Truce of Venice, in March, 1177, which yielded all substantial points for which the cities contended. Frederic made his peace with Alexander and was again taken into the bosom of the church. The permanent treaty with the Lombards was finally signed in June, 1183, at Constance. By it the emperor granted to the cities of the Lombard League all the royal rights which they had ever had, or at that moment enjoyed. "The cities were allowed to build fortifications, to continue their league, and make such other combinations as they wished. They had complete jurisdiction over their own members, could levy troops, coin money, and exercise practically all regalian rights. The imperial *podestas* disappeared, and henceforth the *podesta* was but a foreign judge called in by the citizens, in the hope that his strangeness to local factions would make him an impartial magistrate. The only clauses which upheld the supremacy of the emperor stipulated that the consul should receive im-

perial confirmation, that a right of appeal should lie to the imperial court, and that the emperor should still have a claim to receive the *fodrum regale* as a contribution to his military expenses."

In the frank and honest effort which Frederic put forth to live up to the conditions of this peace without any attempt to evade or annul them, is seen the real greatness of the man, a man even greater in adversity than in success. A comparison with King John of England, some years later, under similar circumstances, will but emphasize the fact that when Frederic was drowned while crossing a small stream in Pisidia upon the third crusade, the Christian world lost one of its noblest standard bearers. The Peace of Constance in 1183 was another compromise in which neither party gained all it contended for, but it is notable as anticipating Magna Charta in virtually asserting the principle that rulers as well as subjects are bound by law. It marks a step in the advance of political righteousness and equity in the time-long struggle with tyranny and wrong. When the conflict was resumed the successors of Hildebrand had gained such decided advantage that they subjected the feudal princes of Europe to the rule of the church until a form of government was developed which was superior to both empire and papacy.

## CHAPTER XXXV

### THE TRIUMPH OF THE PAPACY

A CENTURY and more had gone by between Hildebrand and Innocent III. No proclamation of claims so signal and important as that of Canossa had since that time been promulgated, but these claims had never been modified in the least. Adrian IV and Alexander III set forth the same, and labored most valiantly to make them good, although the development of nationality had, in the meantime, made their task infinitely more difficult. Before the time of Innocent III the popes had actually established many precedents which involved the supremacy of the Roman pontiff over all temporal rulers. Popes had excommunicated sovereigns and released their subjects from all allegiance. They had called sovereigns to account for flagrant outrages upon the church and for immoral living. They had received kingdoms as feudal fiefs from their sovereigns. They had granted kingdoms that had no legitimate lord, or whose lord had been infidel, to persons of their nomination. They had frequently interfered in the election of an emperor and had acted as judge or arbiter in the case of last resort and that, too, by their own nomination. They had assumed this power for so long that Christendom had ceased to consider it extravagant and had very largely taken them at their own valuation. The triumph of the spiritual power was, outside of the nobility, earnestly desired by the whole people of Europe. The Latin clergy had been asserting the supremacy of the church over all other powers for more than a hundred years, and this leadership had been preached with such enthusiasm and conviction that the idea had become common. Man's natural sentiment of order harmonized with this idea of government, and its impracticability had not yet been proved. The crusades had helped the popes in

building up their power by weakening that of their rivals. The cross was the papal emblem and the popes assumed the power of summoning all Christians to service under this banner. The raising of the cross was looked upon as a compulsory levy by all Europe and to follow it was the duty of every one who was capable of bearing arms. For a person, no matter how powerful, to refuse to assume the cross was looked upon as an impious act, and one to bar him from the blessings of heaven. In fact, the more powerful the ruler, the more did it appear to be his duty to go on a crusade if summoned. It was this spirit that took such men as Robert of Normandy, Richard of England, Philip of France, and Godfrey of Bouillon, on the "pilgrimages of grace" to the holy land. Although Conrad III of Hohenstaufen knew full well that he was needed at home in the arduous task of building up the imperial power and enforcing law and order among his own people, yet he yielded to the importunities of St. Bernard, and led the strength and chivalry of the empire upon a hapless expedition into Asia Minor where their bones were left to whiten on the plains and in the mountain passes. His great successor, Frederic Barbarossa, lost his life in another vain attempt to rescue the sepulcher of the Saviour. In this way the adversaries of the pope were weakened by loss of men and treasure, and suffered in reputation by their unsuccessful expeditions, while the popes grew in favor and power by reason of the calamities that fell upon others. It is worthy of note that while emperors and kings lost their lives and fortunes in their vain attempts to build up the papal power, no pope ever went upon a crusade and when those strange and fantastic movements had spent themselves the papacy was found to have increased its wealth many fold by reason of the losses that had fallen upon others.

But after all this has been said, papal authority grew to its commanding height not by reason of fortuitous circumstances, but by its assertion of eternal principles of justice, righteousness, and humanity. This was its claim to the veneration and reverence of humanity. It brought about strife and bloodshed. It trampled upon justice. But it

still proclaimed a higher ultimate end. So far as language was concerned the papacy was still profoundly religious. The pope was in his words "the servant of the servants of God." He really imagined himself the vicar and representative of Christ.

Says the historian Milman, "At no period of the history of the papacy could the boldest assertion of the spiritual power, or even the most daring usurpation, so easily have disguised itself to the loftiest mind under the sense of duty to God and to mankind; never was season so favorable for the aggrandizement of the pope, never could his aggrandizement appear a greater blessing to the world. Wherever Innocent cast his eyes over Christendom and beyond the limits of Christendom appeared disorder, contested thrones, sovereigns oppressing their subjects, subjects in arms against their sovereigns, the ruin of the Christian cause. In Italy, the crown of Naples on the brow of an infant; the fairest provinces under the galling yoke of fierce German adventurers; the Lombard republics, Guelf or Ghibelline, at war within their walls, at war or in implacable animosity against each other; the empire distracted by rival claimants for the throne, one vast scene of battle, intrigue almost anarchy; the tyrannical and dissolute Philip Augustus, king of France, before long the tyrannical and feeble John, king of England. The Byzantine Empire is tottering to its fall; the kingdom of Jerusalem confined almost to the city of Acre. Every realm seemed to demand, or at least to invite, the interposition, the mediation, of the head of Christendom; in every land one party at least, or one portion of society, would welcome his interference in the last resort for refuge or for protection."

In order that we may understand, to any great degree, the well-marked epoch in the history of civilization of the world which is known as the Reign of Innocent III it will be necessary to know something of the private character and history of the man who did so much to mold it.—Next to Gregory VII, Innocent III was undoubtedly the greatest pope that ever occupied the chair of St. Peter. If the great idea of a Christian republic with a pope at its head was ever to be

realized, none could bring more lofty, more varied qualifications for its accomplishment, none could fall on more favorable times than Innocent III. His father was a member of the famous house of Conti from which already several popes had sprung. He had given to him the very best training of the age and he cultivated to the utmost his eminent gifts and talents by the study of theology under Peter of Corbeil at Paris, and canon law at Bologna and Rome. Family influence, combined with his undoubted ability, pushed him rapidly to the front. He was created cardinal-deacon by his uncle, Clement III, in 1190, and intrusted with the management of much of the business of the papacy. He was by birth, education and knowledge of affairs excellently fitted for his post of high honor. At the time of his election he was only thirty-seven years of age, thus bringing to his duties the vigor and fire of youth. Upon the death of Celestine III, in 1198, Lothario was chosen unanimously to succeed him by the college of cardinals, and their selection was ratified by the city of Rome. He took the title of Innocent III and proceeded without loss of time to take up the duties of his high office. —

To find out the views of this man who has been elevated to the highest honor in the world, it will only be necessary to quote from his own writings. In a letter to Otto, written only one month after his coronation, he states:—"The papacy has a preëminence over royalty. The authority of the latter is exercised on earth and over the bodies of men; that of the former, in Heaven and affects the souls. Kings rule over particular countries, provinces and lands; but Peter is superior to them all in power, and enjoys the fullness of authority, inasmuch as he is the Vicar of Him who has the supreme dominion of the world."—Again his inaugural sermon expressed his ideal of the pontifical character: "Ye see what manner of servant that is whom the Lord hath set over his people; no other than the vicegerent of Christ; the successor of Peter. He stands in the midst between God and man: below God, above man; less than God, more than man. He judges all, is judged by none, for it is written — 'I will judge.' But he whom the preëminence of dignity

exalts, is lowered by his office of a servant, that so humility may be exalted, and pride abased; for God is against the high-minded and to the lowly he shows mercy; and he who exalteth himself shall be abased.” With such a lofty concept of his office as is revealed by these words, we can but expect action, and we will find that he was in no way content with idle words; unequivocal acts followed; they were no less energetic than those of Gregory VII.—His first thoughts were directed to the reformation of the papal court; the restoration of the pope’s temporal power; the deliverance of Italy from the rule of the stranger; the separation of the two Sicilies from Germany; and to make the authority of the head of the church felt throughout the length and breadth of Christendom. The power of Innocent was quickly recognized throughout Europe. He laid France under interdict and forced Philip Augustus to take back his repudiated wife, Ingeberga of Denmark. He compelled Alfonso IX of Leon to break off a marriage he had contracted with his niece, and gave the crown of Aragon to Peter II only after he had promised annual tribute. He made Sancho I of Portugal, who had promised to pay a certain amount of tribute and had not done so, place his kingdom under the protection of the Holy See. He settled difficulties in Poland, Hungary, and Norway, and mixed in the politics of England, receiving that country as a fief from King John. He again took possession of the long-disputed heritage of Matilde, organizing it as a fief of the church and driving out the German officers who had been placed there by Henry VII. He aided the widowed Constance by making good the claim of her infant son, Frederic, to the crown of Sicily and, after the death of the princess, in 1198, acted as guardian for her son and strove long and faithfully in upholding his rights against German, Saracen, and Greek freebooters.—However, all the political activity on the part of Innocent is cited merely to show how vast and far-reaching was his influence and power. It is not with these nations we are to deal, as the third and last act in the great mediaeval drama does not have the kings of England, France, Poland, and Spain as actors. The popes, on the one hand, and the suc-

cessors of Hildebrand's imperial antagonists, on the other, are the sole occupiers of the stage.

Before the death of Henry VI he took precautions for the succession of his infant son, Frederic, but it soon became apparent that the German princes would not accept him as a ruler. Philip of Swabia, a younger brother of Henry VI, after striving faithfully to seat his little nephew on the throne, was himself elected king of the Germans by a diet held at Mülhausen on the 8th of March, 1198. Otto, the second son of Henry the Lion, who had been the uncompromising enemy of the Hohenstaufen, was chosen king by a dissatisfied faction at a diet held at Cologne in June of the same year. The cause of Otto was championed by Richard of England whilst the king of France favored Philip of Swabia. A ten-years' civil war followed between Philip and Otto. The German princes quite generally favored the Hohenstaufen, while Innocent III championed the cause of Otto. In this struggle the pope assumed the right of acting as judge, and decided in favor of Otto on the ground, he said, of general fitness, that prince belonging to a devout stock and himself a champion of the church. Philip was finally assassinated and for a time Otto reigned supreme. But he became involved in a quarrel with Innocent and the pope withheld his favor and had the young Frederic crowned as a rival king. The empire was thus distracted and weakened so that it could not check the rapid development of the papal power.

But Innocent did not confine himself wholly to the upholding of the temporal power of the papacy, although in this he adopted energetic measures. He led a crusade against heresy which was not a mere war against the enemies of the wealth and power of the church, as some have held. He saw and understood the tendencies which were to transform the spiritual life of the thirteenth century. He favored Dominic and Francis and was largely instrumental in their success. But it is as the conqueror and organizer, rather than as the priest or prophet, that Innocent made his mark in the church. Toward the end of life, Innocent held a general council of the church, known as the Fourth

Lateran Council. This was probably the greatest gathering of churchmen in the history of the world.—More than four hundred bishops were in attendance together with a vast throng of abbots and priests. Although Innocent was broken in health and knew his end was near he presided in person and had a deep interest in all the proceedings. On summoning the council Innocent stated that he “had two things specifically at heart, the deliverance of the Holy Land, and the reform of the Church Universal.”—

The council strove hard and with a unity of purpose to carry into effect the program of the pope.—Its first step was to proscribe all heresies. It decreed that all rulers should promise not to tolerate any heretics within their dominions, and that any prince refusing to comply with an injunction of the church to purge his dominions of heresy was to be punished with excommunication, and in case of contumacy to be deposed if necessary by force of arms. “It strove to quicken enthusiasm for the fifth crusade which the pope had urgently striven for, and passed a drastic scheme for the reformation of the internal life of the church.” “It strove to elevate the morals and the learning of the clergy, to check their worldliness and covetousness, and to restrain them from abusing the authority of the church through excessive zeal, or more corrupt motives.” The purpose of the seventy canons passed by this council was to regulate and ameliorate the influence of the church on society.—To attempt such a gigantic task speaks well for the character and the intelligence of both pope and council, even though that which they undertook was in many cases impossible of accomplishment. This lofty program of reform, enunciated by Innocent and enacted by a willing council, brought his pontificate to a glorious end. Innocent III was by far the most powerful of all the popes and, unlike his great and unhappy predecessor Hildebrand, was so fortunate as to die at the height of his power, beloved by the church at large. He died at Perugia, in the summer of 1216, in the fifty-sixth year of his age and the nineteenth of his pontificate. He advanced grand views, adopted energetic measures, laid firm foundations for the theocracy

and raised again the papal pretensions to the height they reached with Gregory VII. He never appreciated the precarious nature of the tenure of papal power and had no vision of the rising tide of democracy.

It may be truthfully stated that at the death of Frederic Barbarossa the power of the papacy was decidedly in the ascendant. It had come out of a conflict with the empire, victorious in all that made a victory valuable. It had championed the cause of liberty, and liberty was triumphant. But the empire was not yet vanquished. Circumstances conspired to give to the empire strength where it had heretofore been weak. Its grasp had been feeble in Italy because the emperor had possessed next to no land in the peninsula and the sentiment of loyalty had been very much weakened by this fact. The inheritance of the kingdom of Naples and Sicily passed into the hands of a woman as sole heiress, by the death of William II. This woman, Constance, had married Henry, the eldest son of Frederic Barbarossa, in 1186. Upon the death of Frederic, Henry succeeded to the crown of Germany. He also controlled through his wife the Sicilian kingdom. Thus it was that the Hohenstaufen had one imperial territory to the south and another to the north of the papal states, which lay like a narrow wedge between. It looked to Henry VI as if he could at last compel the pope to recognize the imperial theory of universal government and give up his vain pretensions. But Henry died after a brief reign of only seven years, leaving an infant son to make good his quasi-claim upon the imperial crown. As this infant became the last determined champion of secularism before the empire finally succumbed to the popes, he deserves particular notice.

Frederic II was just twenty years old when the death of Innocent III allowed him to govern as well as to reign. The English historian, Matthew Paris, speaks of Frederic as "the wonder of the world." Mr. Freeman says that "there probably never lived a human being endowed with greater natural gifts, or whose natural gifts were, according to the means offered him by his age, more sedulously cultivated. Warrior, statesman, lawgiver, scholar, there

was nothing in the compass of the political or intellectual world of his age which he failed to grasp." By birth he was half Norman and half German; by birth-place, Italian rather than German. Sensual and luxurious, he was also vigorous and brave in war and astute in politics. Preferring strict orthodoxy in religion and enforcing it in legislation, lifelong contact with the Saracen and natural affinities with Islamite art and science made him tolerant of Islamism. By nature a free thinker, his reverence for Christian truth and life as exhibited in the Roman Church was not enhanced by the examples of contemporary prelates, nor by the cruel injustice which he experienced at the hands of the vicegerent of Christ. He had all the energy and knightly valor of his father, Henry, and his grandfather, Barbarossa, but he loved not war. He had inherited from his mother and had fostered by education among the orange groves of Palermo, a love of luxury and beauty, an intellect refined, subtle and philosophic. It is only through the mist of calumny and fable that we discern the outline of the true man. He had all the learning, knowledge, and accomplishments of the day. He was master of the Mussulman arts and sciences, skilled in Christian scholasticism and philosophy; he knew Latin, Greek, French, German, Italian, Sicilian, Arabic and Hebrew. All these were to him as natural tongues. He had a great interest in architecture; he fostered Italian sculpture and painting and was himself no mean artist; he cultivated Italian poetry and was himself a poet of high grade; he delighted in geometry and astronomy; he regulated his public and private life by the predictions of the astrologers, claiming at his death that not only the time of that event but the place had been foretold; he was curious in natural history and formed an extensive and valuable collection of strange and curious animals, studying their structure and habits with the greatest care. The wonder of the Italians was excited by the camels and dromedaries that were employed in carrying his baggage, while an elephant, presented to him by the Sultan of Egypt, was as famous as that one owned by Charlemagne. He studied veterinary science in order that he might care for his animals, while con-

cern for his own health made him acquainted with surgery and medicine. He enjoyed hunting and hawking, and wrote a treatise on falconry that attests his knowledge both of zoology and anatomy. He was by nature a freethinker and his reverence for Christian truth was not enhanced by his acquaintance with its chief exponents. He punished heresy throughout his own dominions, yet life-long contact with the Saracen and natural affinities with Islamite art and science made him tolerant of Islamism. Artful, cynical, skeptical, he was a trained diplomat and used all the arts of the statesman with unscrupulous finesse.

The political theory of Frederic II differed from that of his grandfather, Barbarossa. He held, rather, the theory of coördination. Recognizing the spiritual sovereignty of the pope, he denied him the temporal supremacy which he claimed for himself. Innocent III died before any clash could come, but his successors championed his views, and Frederic soon fell into disfavor with them. Placed as the empire was, it was scarcely possible for its head not to be involved in war with the papacy. The latter was continually pushing forward its claim to sovereignty in Italy. Frederic had unthinkingly given to the popes that followed Innocent in quick succession a hold upon him which they were not slow to take advantage of. At his coronation he gave a boyish promise to Innocent to go on a crusade. His failure to fulfill this vow immediately was looked upon as impious neglect, although his enemies must have recognized the necessity of his quelling disturbance at home and organizing his Sicilian kingdom. So long as the easy-going Honorius III occupied the papal throne, trouble was easily avoided; but when Gregory IX was chosen as his successor, a change was immediately inaugurated. That stern and indomitable old man proceeded immediately to reduce Frederic to submission. He was at once excommunicated for not going on a crusade as he had promised. He started and his force was smitten with an epidemic before embarking. Frederic returned and was again excommunicated for his disobedience. He finally, when he thought the time propitious, went upon the crusade without waiting for the removal of the pope's anathema.

For this he was again excommunicated. He succeeded in making a favorable peace with the Sultan by which Jerusalem, Nazareth, and Bethlehem were rescued from the hands of the infidel. Although a heretic, he accomplished more for the Christian cause than a generation of orthodox pilgrims had been able to do. After completing this advantageous peace, he sailed for Italy and was again excommunicated for returning. He found that Gregory had devastated Apulia with fire and sword while he was absent. He drove the papal troops over the frontier and threatened the patrimony of St. Peter. Gregory IX was finally glad to make peace at the instigation of Salza and Leopold, Duke of Austria. On July 23, 1230, the Peace of San Germano was signed between Gregory IX and Frederic II. The emperor promised to protect the dominions of the pope. The pope, in turn, removed his excommunication and again admitted Frederic to the bosom of the church. This peace lasted for nine years, but was interrupted by the rebellion of Frederic's son, Henry. Meantime Frederic subdued the Lombard cities and completed his organization of Italy, establishing a government for his Sicilian kingdom far in advance of the times.

The Peace of San Germano lasted for nine years and was made use of by Frederic in subduing the Lombard cities and completing his organization of Italy. Gregory was also very busy during these nine years in suppressing disturbances, organizing the inquisition, and encouraging the new order of mendicant friars. His greatest work and one for which he is most justly famous was the codification of the ecclesiastical laws. For this work he was specially well fitted as he was a remarkably skilful and learned lawyer. The codification of these laws was completed in 1234 and printed under the title of *Nova Compilatio Decretalium*, in 1473, at Mainz.

Upon the accession of Innocent IV the war that for a time had slumbered burst forth again between emperor and pope. It seems only to have gathered strength in the interim. The old war cries of Henry and Hildebrand, of Barbarossa and Alexander, roused again all the hatred of Italian factions. The pope set up rival claimants to the empire and declared

that the power of Peter, symbolized by the two keys, was temporal as well as spiritual. The emperor appealed to Roman law to substantiate his own claim and denounced those set forth by the pope as folly. He laughed at anathema, upbraided the avarice of the church, drove the friars out of his kingdom, and made prisoners of the commissioners sent from Germany to a council at Rome. Innocent IV was compelled to take refuge in France, but he still struggled on. By intrigue and conspiracy he succeeded in forming an anti-imperialistic league in Germany, and stirring up the Sicilian and Apulian barons against the emperor. This drama dragged its weary way through four years. Meantime mediæval idealism, represented by the two grand conceptions of the Middle Ages, the Holy Roman Church and the Holy Roman Empire, was suffering mortal enfeeblement. Long before the end of the struggle the church had ceased to be *holy, Roman or sacerdotal*, while the empire never was, save in name, *holy, Roman or imperial*.

Frederic died in 1250, worn out by his long struggle and pursued to his death, and after, by papal maledictions and slanders, which represented him as dying unreconciled to the church, and his son Manfred as having hastened his death by smothering him with a pillow. This is perhaps the basest of all the slanders which were heaped upon his name. His sons, Manfred and Conrad IV, continued the struggle for a time, but were completely overthrown by the French forces that now came to the aid of the papacy. Conrad was captured and hung by Charles of Anjou, and thus the glorious Hohenstaufen, unrivaled in splendor among the houses of Germany, came to a sad, unmerited, and ignoble end.

The fiction of an equal partnership between the spiritual and the universal temporal sovereign, for the control of all men by a harmonious system, passed into the reality of a theocracy administered by the pope. From 1250 Europe, accordingly, acquiesced for half a century and the greater part of Europe for two centuries in the view which had been formulated in the canon law during the pontificate of Gregory IX. The character assigned to the Bishop of Rome by the framers of this canon law is as august and venerable

as any which it has ever entered into man's imagination to conceive. Europe was considered in this system as one vast moral territory, of which the pope was the supreme magistrate, on whom the eyes of all were fixed, and to whom every one could appeal as the tutelary and incorruptible guardian of truth and justice. "Beyond the reach of clashing passions and numberless temptations by which the children of men are beset, the sole object of authority was to secure for every Christian, that future happiness which is the certain reward of virtue. For this grand end he promulgated laws, dictated by the spirit of unerring wisdom, which prevented crime while they purified intention, and which no one, without violating his duty to the great European family, could venture to disobey. Greater than monarch by his functions, humbler than the humblest by his inclinations, his officers were peace, and his exactors righteousness. Unlike the reluctant services wrung from their miserable serfs by the oppressors among whom Europe had been portioned out, the homage which the pope received from submissive millions was the willing unforced obedience of grateful children; and the power which he exercised was to guide the ignorant in the way, and to protect him that had no helper against the mighty and terrible."

Thus while the face of Europe was disfigured by a thousand ridiculous and discordant customs, the offspring of violence and barbarity, there was, among them all, "a law transcendent and sublime, guarded by sanctions which all revered, enforced by authority which all acknowledged, by which the conqueror and the conquered, the warrior and the peasant, the layman and the priest, nay by which the judge and the criminal who trembled before the seat of justice, were knit together by one common brotherhood.

"And if compelled by the perverseness of his subjects, he with whom this divine prerogative had been deposited was obliged to change the voice of paternal tenderness for that of admonition and rebuke, he addressed the wanderers like little children whom he sought to reclaim rather than as rebels whom it was his duty to chastise."

From 1250 to the reformation, Europe was as complete

a theocracy as was ever the Jewish nation at its best estate. Exceptions to this will of course be found as nations, like individuals, are subject to the law of growth and change. "Inconsistency was the only characteristic in which the Middle Ages were uniformly consistent." But we cannot on that account any more deny that Europe, from the thirteenth to the sixteenth century, was theocratic, than we can deny that, on account of immorality in England and America today, these countries are in the broad sense Christian.



Date Due



BW901 .S83 v.2  
The history of Christianity from the

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00015 7497